

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XVI.

October, 1910.

No. 7.

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,  
BALTIMORE.

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

---

*Vol. XVI.*

*October, 1910.*

---

*No. 7.*

## THE ECCLESIOLOGY OF SAINT CYPRIAN.

---

Few figures in the early Church loom larger on the view than does that of St. Cyprian, the martyr-bishop of Carthage. Irenaeus may excel him because of his more intimate connection with the stream of Apostolical tradition and of his wider acquaintance with different parts of Christendom; Tertullian may surpass him in the vehemence and greater legal acumen with which he assailed and crushed the enemies of the Church; Origen may go far beyond him in the extent of his erudition, and the bold originality of his speculations; but for us Cyprian has an interest and importance all his own. This arises chiefly from the fact that he was preëminently a practical man, who occupied a prominent position in the Church at a period when she passed through one of the most perilous crises of her troubled career, and because he has left us abundant testimony of the same in his many treatises and voluminous correspondence. Cyprian was neither a philosopher nor a theologian, he was by nature and profession a skilled man of the world and an able administrator. Such is the character impressed on the various documents he has transmitted to us. They are concerned with the government of the Church of Christ as a whole and in its constituent parts, they deal with the relations of subjects and rulers, they teach how peace and concord are to be maintained, and how unity is to be preserved, so that the one fold may remain under one Shepherd and the Body of Christ continue undivided. Whence it may



be inferred what an unrivalled witness is Cyprian to the constitution of the Church in the middle of the third century. But it is not alone for their constructiveness and the positive teaching they contain that the pages of Cyprian are valuable, but also because of the diversity of local custom and traditional belief they manifest. Reason had not yet begun to operate on the deposit of faith so as to discover what were the underlying principles that governed the accepted articles of belief, and the daily practices of the churches. Differences of opinion and divergences of custom had not been critically examined to ascertain their origin to see how far they were mutually antagonistic, or severally in accord with true apostolic or divine tradition, and to disclose whither they might lead the Church if persevered in and followed out to their logical issues. Accordingly the writings of Cyprian, in which we may hope to get a plain, unvarnished reflex of the age in which he ruled the See of Carthage, must possess an interest for the critic and the theologian who wishes to trace the growth and development of Catholic doctrine and to discover how the individual doctrines were regarded at the various stages of the progress of the Church.

But there is another and more fundamental reason why the personality of Cyprian should claim our special attention. He stands to witness for or against one of the most cherished and vital doctrines of the Catholic Church, and that which essentially divides us from our Christian neighbors. Protestants claim him as one of the earliest defenders of their position, who bravely opposed, even in its infancy, the intolerable arrogance of Rome's domination. When the serpent of papal supremacy first raised its head in the person of Stephen, it was struck down by Cyprian and his friend Firmilian the venerable bishop of Caesarea. But they only scotched the snake, not killed it, wherefore it closed and became itself again; nay more, it grew strong with the growth of years until to-day it holds the Catholic world enslaved. Now in these pages we do not propose to ourselves to champion Catholicity, nor to assail Protestantism—time and the advance of historical

knowledge have proved the best discriminator of the claims of both—but we intend, after having made for ourselves a close and critical scrutiny of every line of the compositions written by the hand of our author, in so far as they have come down to us, to dispassionately set forth Cyprian's notion of Christianity as an organization instituted by Christ and His Apostles and destined by them to last for all ages as the custodian and expounder of the deposit of faith, and the dispenser of the mysteries of salvation. In this investigation we shall naturally devote special attention to the position occupied by the Bishop of Rome, but to that we must lead up by first pointing out how the Christian religion, as it spread throughout the world and established local churches, over each of which ruled a monarch entitled a bishop, still retained that unity in catholicity so characteristic of it, and on which Cyprian laid such stress. Before we begin, however, it may be well to remark that the Catholic Church does not build her dogma of papal supremacy on the testimony of any one Father of the Church, nor on their combined testimony for that matter, but on the more solid basis of Scripture itself, where we claim to find abundant evidence to show that Christ granted Peter a primacy over the Apostolic College, and that Peter should have successors in this primacy for all time. Hence while we should be anxious to find all the available evidence of the early Church on our side, as it would show the belief of the infant church in the Catholic doctrines, and we should be thereby reassured that we interpret those texts of Scripture aright, still we need not be disappointed if we find an odd Father in the first centuries, when the teachings of faith were as yet vague and indefinite, ignorant of, if not antagonistic to, our unmistakable and cherished beliefs. From which it follows that a Catholic may quite freely and without the least bias probe the writings of even the most prominent Father of the early church, and declare on the sole strength of the evidence, whether he was, from our view-point, orthodox or heterodox in regard to any particular dogma.



## I. SKETCH OF LIFE.

Caecilius Thascius Cyprian, a native of Carthage, was a man of social rank, well-educated, an eloquent rhetorician and distinguished advocate. Of serious turn of mind, even as a pagan he felt kindly disposed towards Christianity, which he was led to embrace, about the year 246 A. D., by the example and instruction of a venerable old priest named Caecilius. His was no half-hearted conversion, for, once he had come into possession of the Faith and the treasures of divine revelation and grace, he abandoned all his previous pursuits, and devoted himself entirely to the service of God and His Church. The profane classics to which he was attached, he now deserts and turns with all his energies to the close study of the Sacred Scriptures. How he mastered these latter appears in his subsequent writings, which abound in scriptural quotations and references. Besides the sacred text, he was a constant and intense student of the Christian works of Tertullian for whom he entertained the greatest admiration. On these two sources he almost altogether relied for his knowledge of Christian doctrine, supplemented of course by the traditions of the church of Carthage. He was scarcely three years converted when he was chosen to succeed Donatus as bishop of the primatial See of proconsular Africa, so great must have been the esteem felt for him at Carthage and throughout the whole province, yet there were five priests, afterwards destined to cause him much trouble, who felt indignant that a neophyte should be placed over their heads. Raised to the episcopate (c. 249) he fulfilled that office for the next eight or nine years with the intensest zeal and in the ablest manner. In spite of the severest persecution that ever assailed the church, and which created havoc among the faithful, long accustomed to peace and enervated by prosperity, and in the teeth of a still more treacherous attack from rebellious children within the fold, he stood firm. Cyprian was equal to every emergency, and although he was inspired in the interests of the church to retire before the furious onslaughts of

Decius, he did not desert his flock but was ever present by his warm letters of exhortation and encouragement, and reproof when necessary. He had further to uphold discipline and to chastise the faction who under Felicissimus and Novatus were deceiving the confessors by adulation, exalting them above the bishop, and misleading the lapsed by false indulgence in granting them premature peace. But Cyprian's boundless energies were not confined to his own See, nor even to the large province of Africa, of which he held the position of primate, but were directed to whatever part of the Catholic Church stood in need of assistance. When the Decian persecution came to an end and Rome selected Cornelius as Bishop (251), Novation, a brilliant but desperately ambitious man, set himself up in opposition, and rivalled Cornelius in claiming the allegiance of the whole church. Cyprian came to the rescue, and by his matchless pen, did more than any other cause to avert the growth and extension of an imminent and appalling schism, and to uphold the undivided unity of the Catholic church. He ruled the Church of Africa while the five popes Cornelius, Lucius, Stephen, Sixtus II and Dionysius governed in succession the See of Rome. The Re-baptism controversy arose during the reign of Stephen, when Rome and Carthage found themselves in opposing camps. The Church got scarce any respite from suffering during the episcopate of Cyprian. In 257 a new edict was issued against her by Valerian, when the bishop of Carthage was arrested and, after a short period of exile, was condemned to death. He gladly immolated himself as martyr of that faith for which he had zealously labored during his short yet brilliant career as shepherd of the fold of Christ.

- This brief sketch of the life and times of Cyprian may be of some use to us in estimating his doctrines and practices. It will help to give a setting to the testimony we bring forward, and enable us to weigh more judiciously our evidence, especially in so far as it bears on the relations of Carthage to other churches and particularly to that of Rome. In reading the documents we have noted those passages which throw



any light on the constitution of the Church, and considered with greater care whatever may help to determine the position of the Roman See, and to define its relations to all the local churches throughout the world. The result of our investigation we shall set forth in the following pages.

## II. ECCLESIASTICAL UNITY.

Unity, to the mind of Cyprian, is the fundamental property of the Church's constitution. From this he deduces all his other concepts. Christ builds His Church upon Peter and commits its government to the Apostolic College. To this society was entrusted custody of the deposit of faith and the dispensation of the mysteries of salvation. Hence within the Church alone can one hope to be saved, there is no chance for those who have not entered her, or who, once within, have cut themselves off from her communion by heresy or schism. To be in union with the one Catholic Church is to be in touch with the fountain of eternal life. She alone can remit sin, she alone can beget children to God as the spotless spouse of Christ. All other churches are harlots and adulteresses, the consorts of Satan to generate sons of perdition. From which we clearly see that Cyprian regarded membership of the one Church as absolutely indispensable to salvation. In what this unity consisted we can here but show in a general way by the proof and illustrations he adduces in support of its necessity. After quoting the words of St. Paul "There is one Body, and one Spirit, one hope of your calling, one Faith, one Baptism, one God," he continues, "the Church is one, which is spread abroad far and wide into a multitude by an increase of fruitfulness. As there are many rays of the sun but one light; and many branches of a tree but one strength based in its tenacious root; and since from one spring flow many streams, yet the unity is still preserved in the source. Separate a ray of the sun from its body of light, its unity does not allow a division of light; break a branch from a tree—when broken it will not be able to bud; cut off the stream from its fountain



and that which is cut off dries up. Thus also the Church shone over with the light of the Lord, sheds forth her rays over the whole world, yet it is one light which is everywhere diffused, nor is the unity of the body separated. Her fruitful abundance spreads her branches over the whole world. She broadly expands her rivers, yet her head is one, her source is one; and she is one mother plentiful in the results of fruitfulness, from her womb we are born, by her milk we are nourished, by her spirit we are animated. . . . He who forsakes the Church of Christ cannot attain to the rewards of Christ. He can no longer have God for his Father who has not the Church for his mother. If anyone could escape who was outside the ark of Noah, then he also may escape who is outside of the Church. . . . Does anyone believe that this unity which thus comes from the divine strength and coheres in celestial sacraments, can be divided in the Church, and can be separated by the parting asunder of opposing wills? He who does not hold the unity does not hold God's law, does not hold the faith of the Father and the Son, does not hold life and salvation. This sacrament of unity, this bond of concord inseparably cohering is set forth where in the Gospel the coat of Jesus is not at all divided nor cut, but is received as an entire garment and is possessed as an uninjured and undivided robe. . . . As the twelve tribes of Israel were divided the prophet Ahias rent his garment. But because Christ's people cannot be rent, His robe woven and united throughout is not divided by those who possess it; undivided, united, connected it shows the coherent concord of our people who put on Christ. By the sacrament and sign of his garment he has declared the unity of the Church."<sup>1</sup> We have quoted this passage at length, as it gives a good idea of the strict unity of the church to which Cyprian holds each must belong as a condition of salvation. In chapter 23, of the same work we find:—"God is one and Christ is one and His Church is one, and the faith is one, and the people is joined into a substantial unity of body by the cement of concord." On this same notion of

<sup>1</sup> *De Unitate Ecclesiae* (5-7).

unity he harps in divers places throughout all his epistles. It is no exaggeration to say that on it he bases all the arguments he employs in defence of the Church and her doctrines. In a letter to his clergy during the persecution he speaks of the schismatics at Carthage in these terms: "They are now offering peace who have not peace themselves. They are promising to recall and bring back the lapsed into the Church, who themselves have departed from the Church. There is one God and Christ is one, and there is one Church and one Chair founded upon the rock by the Word of the Lord."<sup>2</sup> When Cyprian speaks of "one Chair" as he does so often, he means as a rule, except where better defined, the one episcopal chair which by divine appointment is to rule each church, which is clear from these words of *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, Ch. 8,<sup>3</sup> where, after quoting the words of Christ, "And there shall be one flock and one shepherd," he asks: "And does anyone believe that in one place there can be many shepherds and many flocks?" Of the Novation party who came to Africa to gain over Cyprian to their side, he speaks thus:<sup>4</sup> "They are striving here also to distract the members of Christ into schismatical parties, and to cut and tear the one body of the Catholic Church." In another letter to Pope Cornelius he speaks in a similar strain in reference to the same schismatics: "We are careful to maintain as much as we can the unity delivered by the Lord, and through His Apostles to us their successors, and as far as in us lies to gather into the Church the dispersed and wandering sheep which the wilful faction and heretical temptation of some is separating from their mother,"<sup>5</sup> to which he adds that "those only are left outside who by their obstinacy and madness have persisted and have been unwilling to return to us." Even from the foregoing quotations, which we have adduced to manifest the nature of ecclesiastical unity insisted on by Cyprian, it can be fairly inferred how that unity is guarded. They evidently imply that some persons hold the place of the

<sup>2</sup> Ep. 39<sup>6</sup>. We rely on the *Anti-Nicene Christian Library*, ed. by Roberts and Donaldson for order and translation of Epistles.

<sup>3</sup> U. E. for brevity.

<sup>4</sup> Ep. 40<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Ep. 41<sup>8</sup>.



Apostles as defenders of the one church, while submission to these keeps members within the unity. But of this we must now treat in more detail, and strive to answer the question: What is the principle of unity in the Church, and by what forces is the catholic society of Christians to be maintained one?

### III. THE EPISCOPATE THE PRINCIPLE OF UNITY.

The Catholic Church is preserved one by a common unified authority, called the episcopate. Cyprian expresses the doctrine after this fashion when upholding the unity of the Church: <sup>6</sup> "And this unity we ought firmly to hold and assert especially those of us that are bishops who preside in the Church, that we may also prove the episcopate itself to be one and undivided. . . . The episcopate is one, each part of which is held by each one for the whole." It is not easy at first sight fully to grasp what he understands by this unity and indivisibility of the episcopal authority. He conceives it somewhat after this manner. All power over the faithful was possessed by Christ. But He was not to remain on earth as supreme visible guide, hence, He instituted the apostolic College and bestowed on them as one body His own authority: whence in the words of Cyprian, "the flock of Christ was ruled by the apostles with unanimous consent." This authority, which was one and resided in a body corporate, was transmitted by the apostles to their successors, who were the episcopal body, each member of which receives not, as it were, an isolated and independent office and power, but only, by legitimate succession, becomes a participator in the united government of the Church, which he retains until, through some reason or other, he forfeits his right to share in this authority. Such an exposition renders intelligible passages otherwise difficult of interpretation. For example, in a letter to the African bishop Antonianus, urging on him agreement with Cornelius in opposition to Novation, occur these words: <sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> U. E., c. 5.

<sup>7</sup> Ep. 51<sup>24</sup>.

"There is only one Church divided by Christ throughout the whole world into many members, and also one episcopate diffused through a harmonious multitude of many bishops. . . . Hence Novation is acting in spite of God's tradition, and of the combined and everywhere compacted unity of the Catholic Church. . . . For he could not hold the episcopate, even if he had before been made bishop, since he has cut himself off from the body of his fellow bishops, and from the unity of the Church." From this too becomes plain in what sense Cyprian quotes the Petrine text, "*Tu es Petrus*," as proving that Christ founded the Church on the bishops when he wanted to prove to the arrogant lapsed at Carthage that the control of the Church is in the hands of the bishop, who, therefore, must not be dictated to by them. Here are his words:<sup>8</sup> "Christ describing the honor of a bishop and the order of his Church, speaks in the Gospel, and says to Peter, 'I say unto thee, That thou art Peter,' &c. . . . Thence through the changes of times and successions the ordering of bishops and the plan of the Church flows onwards; *so that the Church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the Church is controlled by these same rulers.*" At first sight it seems as though Cyprian were distorting the sense of the above text, but he really is not, if we bear in mind that he quotes it to prove directly the whole episcopal authority by which the Church is governed, and only indirectly to show that each bishop, in so far as he participates in the universal episcopate, regulates the affairs of the local church. From this same notion of one Church and one universal episcopate, which comprise the numerous local churches and individual bishops, arise the interest each bishop takes in the affairs of the whole Church and the maintenance of peace and unity everywhere, as is manifested by the reply of the Roman Clergy to Cyprian on being informed by him of the intriguing of the deposed African bishop of Lambesa. "For it becomes us all," they say, "to watch for the body of the whole Church whose members are scattered through every various province."<sup>9</sup> Like-

<sup>8</sup> Ep. 26.<sup>9</sup> Ep. 29<sup>4</sup>.



wise we find Cyprian busying himself in the affairs of Spain and Gaul, and Dionysius, of Alexandria, in those of many eastern Churches. They all were conscious of some close bond holding them together, so that the internal disturbance of any one Church redounded to the discredit of the whole. This same feeling of the unity of the episcopal body stimulated the several bishops to adopt all means to facilitate its continuance, hence the adoption of a uniform plan of administration to meet the changing circumstances of the times. "Both our common love, and the reason of the thing," says Cyprian in writing to the Roman Clergy, "demand that I should keep from your knowledge nothing of those matters which are transacted among us, that so we may have a common plan for the advantage of the administration of the Church."<sup>10</sup> Accordingly in dealing with the lapsed a uniform mode of procedure<sup>11</sup> was adopted through the whole Church, and whoever resisted it were cut off from communion. It was the same sense of unity that urged Cyprian to lecture Pope Stephen about Marcian of Arles in these words:<sup>12</sup> "For although we are many shepherds yet we feed one flock, and ought to collect and cherish all the sheep which Christ by His Blood and passion sought for; . . . nor ought we suffer our suppliant and mourning brethren to be cruelly despised and cast down by the haughty presumption of some. Since Marcian by joining Novation has stood forth as the opponent of mercy and love, let him not pronounce sentence but receive it; and let him not so act as if he himself were to judge the college of priests, since he himself is judged by all the priests." By this name Cyprian understands the bishops, because the bishop was the priest *par excellence* of his church, as enjoying the highest grade of the priesthood.

#### IV. MONARCHICAL BISHOP OVER EACH CHURCH.

Now we have seen that the one Catholic Church is governed by a united body of rulers entitled the episcopate. To this belongs every legitimately ordained bishop who holds the com-

<sup>10</sup> Ep. 28.

<sup>11</sup> Ep. 51<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> Ep. 66<sup>4</sup>.

munion of the Church. But from this it must not be inferred that all the bishops rule the whole Church and each of its parts conjointly, somewhat after the manner of a parliament. No, the Church universal is composed of a number of local churches, while over each one of these a solitary and separate bishop holds complete sway. He is the sole shepherd of that portion of the flock, and as Peter was constituted the foundation of the whole Church so the local church is as it were built on its bishop.<sup>13</sup> He controls all the actions of his church and all the faithful within it both laity and clergy are subject to him. An episcopal monarch over each church is of divine appointment<sup>14</sup> so that to set up a rival in the same place, or to rebel against the bishop is to create a schism and to cut oneself off from ecclesiastical unity. Of such vital importance is obedience and submission to the bishop that Cyprian refers again and again to its denial as the origin of all heresies and schisms. The preservation of unity in each church by the subjection of all to the bishop he believes to be tantamount to the protection of Catholic unity. Hence his tract *De Unitate Ecclesiae* does not deal so much with the means of maintaining unity in the whole as in each part—this secured, he took for granted the other was safe. All Cyprian's writings are saturated with this teaching. We shall bring forward some of the most apt references in illustration of the doctrine, after we have first seen what, according to him, was the recognized method of appointing bishops in his day. For once a bishop is lawfully set up, he enters into the full enjoyment of the episcopate within his sphere, and as long as he does not forfeit his office by some crime worthy of deposition, whoever opposes or seeks to supplant him is but creating a schism.

In defending the episcopate of Sabinus against Basilides when the latter, because of his lapse and other grave crimes, had been deposed and supplanted by the former, Cyprian in his letter to the Spanish bishops gives us this information about the ordination of a bishop:<sup>15</sup> "For which reason, he

<sup>13</sup> Ep. 26 and U. E., c. 4.<sup>14</sup> Ep. 41 and 45<sup>2</sup>.<sup>15</sup> Ep. 67<sup>5</sup>.



says, "you must diligently observe and keep the practice delivered from divine tradition and apostolic observance, which is also maintained among us, and almost throughout all the provinces; that for the proper celebration of ordinations all the neighboring bishops of the same province should assemble with that people for which a prelate is ordained; and the bishop should be chosen in the presence of the people, who have most fully known the life of each one. . . . And this also, we see, was done by you in ordination of our colleague Sabinus; so that, by the suffrage of the whole brotherhood, and by the sentence of the bishops who had assembled in their presence, and who had written letters to you concerning him, the episcopate was conferred upon him, and hands were imposed on him in the place of Basilides." To this we may add from a letter of Cyprian to Cornelius these words:<sup>16</sup> "When a bishop is once made and approved by the testimony and judgment of his colleagues and the people, another can by no means be appointed." But, strange as it may appear, Cyprian seems to give the people power to depose the bishop also, if he is guilty of a crime which deserves that penalty. "A people obedient to the Lord's precepts and fearing God ought to separate themselves from a sinful prelate, and not to associate themselves with the sacrifices of a sacrilegious priest, especially since they themselves have the power either of choosing worthy priests, and of rejecting unworthy ones."<sup>17</sup> But probably he includes in the people the other bishops of the province, as we saw already that he considers their presence essential to the ordination.

When Felicissimus and his party set up Fortunatus as anti-bishop at Carthage, they sought recognition at Rome, whence Cyprian wrote to Cornelius informing him of the state of affairs. We quote the following from the letter, as it throws light on the doctrine outlined above. After stating that the schismatics would get a hearing in Africa if they return to allegiance, he continues:<sup>18</sup> "For as has been *decreed by all of us*—and is equally fair and just—that the case of

<sup>16</sup> Ep. 40<sup>2</sup>.<sup>17</sup> Ep. 67<sup>3</sup>.<sup>18</sup> Ep. 64<sup>14</sup>.

everyone should be heard there where the crime has been committed; and a portion of the flock has been assigned to each individual pastor, which he is to rule and govern, having to give an account of his doing to the Lord, it certainly behooves those over whom we are placed not to run about, nor to break up the harmonious agreement of the bishops . . . but there to plead their cause where they may have both accusers and witnesses of their crimes." Note from this passage how there existed already universal rules of discipline, and while Cornelius is not denied the power to try a case, still such a procedure is considered unwise and inexpedient. Even still stronger for the monarchical episcopate is the letter to the Roman Confessors who had espoused the cause of Novation.<sup>19</sup> "It saddens me," he says, "to find that you there, contrary to ecclesiastical order, contrary to evangelical law, contrary to the unity of the Catholic institution, had consented that another bishop should be made. That is what is neither right nor allowable to be done, that another church should be set up, that Christ's members should be torn asunder, that the one mind and body of the Lord's flock should be lacerated by a divided emulation. . . . As we cannot leave the Church and go out to you, we beg you rather to return to the Church your Mother, and to our brotherhood." The Confessors on their return to the Church and the allegiance of Cornelius had to make this profession of faith:<sup>20</sup> "We confess that there ought to be one Bishop in the Catholic Church"; which means simply that each church is governed by one bishop only, and to divide its obedience between two rival bishops is to become schismatic and to fall away from Catholic unity.

Within his church the Bishop ruled and managed all things. He enforced discipline and administered the sacraments; he was the one man set on high to safeguard the flock against false doctrine or any departure from tradition in belief or conduct. Cyprian suspends some rebellious priests at Carthage from 'offering' and imposes on them the obligation of appearing in judgment before him.<sup>21</sup> A priest and deacon

<sup>19</sup> Ep. 43.<sup>20</sup> Ep. 45<sup>2</sup>.<sup>21</sup> Ep. 91<sup>44</sup>.



are cut off from communion for holding intercourse with the lapsed.<sup>22</sup> He excommunicates Felicissimus and his party, consisting of priests and laymen, because of their revolt against the discipline which he had laid down for the treatment of the lapsed.<sup>23</sup> He further decides that should anyone associate with these, he will not be allowed to return to the Church and the communion of the priests and people of Christ.<sup>24</sup> The bishop it was who admitted to Church communion and who cut off from the same. He baptized, imposed hands in confirmation,<sup>25</sup> offered sacrifice as the chief priest, though not the sole one; he with the priests reconciled sinners to the Church,<sup>26</sup> and his was the duty of ordaining the clergy.<sup>27</sup> Whoever resists the bishop acts the part of Korah, Dathan and Abiram who opposed Moses and Aaron, and equally deserves to be cut off by the sword of the spirit, that is, by excommunication.<sup>28</sup> All disunion in the Church arises from disobedience to the bishop who has from God authority to rule the faithful, for "Christ said to the Apostles: 'He that heareth you heareth me,' &c. From this have arisen heresies and schisms, and still arise, in that the bishop who is one and who rules over the Church is contemned."<sup>29</sup> And again, "Neither have heresies arisen nor schisms originated from any other source than that God's priest is not obeyed; nor do they consider that there is one person for the time priest in the Church, and for the time judge instead of Christ; whom, if according to the divine teaching the whole fraternity should obey, no one would stir up anything against the college of priests, no one would rend the Church by a division of the unity of Christ." By the name priest Cyprian often calls the bishop, because he is the chief priest of the Church and the ordainer of priests; and mark how he considers the unity of the whole Church safe if peace and concord reigns in each church. In this he is right to a good extent, for no member of the Church will rise up in revolt against the episcopate so long as he is submissive to his own bishop, and while the bishops are at

<sup>22</sup> Ep. 27<sup>1</sup>.<sup>23</sup> Ep. 23 and 37<sup>2</sup>.<sup>24</sup> Ep. 39<sup>7</sup>.<sup>25</sup> Ep. 39<sup>3</sup>.<sup>26</sup> Ep. 74<sup>4</sup>.<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*<sup>28</sup> U. E., 17.<sup>29</sup> Ep. 68<sup>5</sup>.

agreement with one another. But what if even the bishops fall out, how is unity then to be preserved, especially if each is wholly independent of his colleagues? Cyprian seldom if ever contemplates this case; all his attention is fixed on the maintenance of local unity. However, he does not leave us without data by which to answer the question raised, as we shall see later on. In another place we get a summary of the exalted functions of the bishop, where Cyprian, replying to Pupianus who had questioned the validity of his ordination, answers: If your charge be true "behold now for six years the brotherhood has neither had a bishop, nor the people a prelate, nor the flock a pastor, nor the Church a governor, nor Christ a representative, nor God a priest." After which he sarcastically addresses Pupianus and requests him to pronounce valid his ordination<sup>30</sup> "in order that so great a number of the faithful who have been summoned away under my rule, may not appear to have departed without hope of salvation and of peace; that the new crowd of believers may not be considered to have failed of attaining any grace of baptism and of the Holy Spirit through my ministry; that the peace conferred upon so many lapsed and penitent persons, and the communion vouchsafed by my examination, may not be abrogated by the authority of your judgment." In fine, all we have so far said of the position of a bishop in his church is crowned by one other quotation from this same epistle. Peter's reply to Christ,<sup>31</sup> "Lord to whom shall we go?" shows "that the Church does not depart from Christ; and they are the Church who are the people united to its priest, and the flock which adheres to its pastor. Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the Church and the Church in the Bishop; and if any one be not with the bishop he is not in the Church, and that those flatter themselves in vain who creep in, not having peace with God's priests, and think that they communicate secretly with some; *while the Church which is Catholic and one, is not cut nor divided, but is indeed connected and bound together by the cement of priests who cohere with one another.*"

<sup>30</sup> Ep. 68<sup>5</sup>.<sup>31</sup> Ep. 68<sup>6</sup>.

V. AUTHORITY THE BOND OF UNION AMONG LOCAL ..  
CHURCHES.

We have now seen pretty clearly that the unity of each church is secured by the authority of one man—the Bishop; while we already showed that the union of the whole Church is preserved by a mysterious sort of universal ruling body called the episcopate. We come now to address ourselves more closely to this latter, and to inquire in what exactly it consists. Is it really anything more than the friendly union and confederation of so many separate and independent units of authority possessed by the individual bishops? Is there any reason for it beyond the fact that the local churches possess a common faith and inherit a common tradition by which alone they are united, and feel a common interest as followers of the same founder Jesus Christ? If this be so, is each bishop and local church without superior on earth, and responsible to God alone for the maintenance of the true faith and the observance of the divine and apostolic traditions? Certainly in many places Cyprian would lead one to believe that he knew no higher power on earth than that of the individual bishop who by lawful succession became a participator in the universal episcopate. The circumstances of his time forced him to dwell so persistently on the means of preserving the unity of the local church by submission to one bishop that he almost overlooked how the divine unity of the whole Church was to be secured. In fact he so exaggerated the necessity and importance of local unity that he seems to have thought that Catholic unity was to such a degree dependent on the former, that the latter followed as a necessary consequence on its attainment. It never seems to have occurred to him when writing his tract, *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, that the Catholic Church could be rent asunder, even though each church enjoyed ideal peace within itself. He had afterwards reason to see how such a condition of affairs was possible—when the Re-baptism controversy arose. Even in the course of that dispute and more particularly at the opening of the Council of Carthage, in September 256, Cyprian seems to



assert that each bishop is quite independent within his sphere, he can be judged by no bishop, nor can he judge another, but has to render an account of his actions to God alone. Besides from a few of the quotations already adduced<sup>32</sup> and from many more of a similar strain<sup>33</sup> which occur through his writings one feels strongly inclined to infer that the only bond of union among the different bishops recognized by Cyprian is the peace and concord based on their mutual charity and good-will. This opinion, which Cyprian's theoretical teaching urges one to attribute to him, is not, we believe, the doctrine held by him, for we are convinced that he recognized in the Church something more substantial and definite than a common tradition and the operation of one spirit and mutual good-will by which all the members of Christ, and all the separate churches were to be cemented together and united in one church, 'one body,' 'one flock,' 'one household,' and 'one Spouse of Christ.' We intend to show from his own pages that he was a firm believer in some authority in the Church higher than that enjoyed by each bishop, and that to it each bishop was amenable as often as he committed some crime which deserved censure at the hands of his colleagues.

We have many examples of bishops deposed or excommunicated for various reasons. We are informed that Privatus of Lambesa<sup>34</sup> was condemned by a Council of ninety of his African colleagues under Donatus, the Bishop of Carthage, in which also Pope Fabian had some say. The crime for which he was deposed from the episcopate and excommunicated was heresy. Eusebius<sup>35</sup> informs us that Pope Cornelius deposed the three Italian bishops whom Novation had deceived into ordaining him as anti-Pope, and when they repented of their folly he merely admitted them to lay communion, while he set up other bishops in their stead. Further we know that Fortunatus, the anti-bishop of Carthage, was able to procure five excommunicated African bishops to ordain him.<sup>36</sup> Evaristus, for creating a schism in Italy, was excommunicated and Zetus set up.<sup>37</sup> Besides, Pope Cornelius with the other bishops

<sup>32</sup> Vide 68<sup>s</sup> and 68<sup>s</sup>.<sup>33</sup> Cf. U. E., 14; Ep. 66<sup>s</sup> and 74<sup>3</sup>.<sup>34</sup> Ep. 29<sup>4</sup> and 54.<sup>35</sup> Eusebius, H. E., VI, 43.<sup>36</sup> Ep. 54.<sup>37</sup> Ep. 48, 49.

of the Church laid down a general law that whatever bishop lapsed by sacrificing to idols during time of persecution, should be dismissed from his office, and on repenting should be admitted solely to lay communion while forbidden to resume the office of bishop, or to exercise the priestly function of sacrifice. For the crime of lapse the two Spanish bishops Basilides and Martial were driven out of office by their churches, and Sabinus and Felix were appointed to take their place.<sup>38</sup> Fortunatianus of Assuræ, in Africa, was ordered by Cyprian to be cut off from communion for clinging to his See in opposition to this law.<sup>39</sup> Finally, Cyprian urges Pope Stephen to excommunicate Marcian of Arles, because he held with Novation, and against the decree of the Church, that the lapsed should never be admitted to ecclesiastical communion, not even at the hour of death, no matter how long they repented. What is the conclusion to be necessarily drawn from all these instances? That a bishop was not the supreme authority in the Church, that he himself was subject to some higher tribunal which could call him to account and punish him for his misdeeds.

But there is still further evidence to show that bishops also were subject to authority, and had to abide by laws and regulations made by the Church and in the framing of which they may have had no say, while by the violation of them they may incur the guilt of heresy or at least schism. We have sufficient testimony in Cyprian's pages for the existence of provincial councils. These councils regulate the affairs of the province: they put an end to disputes and enacted decrees by which uniformity of discipline was maintained, and these decrees the bishops of the province should observe. Such councils were held almost twice a year at Carthage. Firmilian, the Bishop of Caesarea, speaks of a similar custom in Asia Minor thus: "It happens of necessity among us, that year by year, the elders and prelates assemble together to arrange those matters committed to our care, so that if any things are more serious they may be directed by our common counsel."<sup>40</sup> In a letter to his colleague Antonianus, Cyprian gives information how the lapsed are to be dealt with and sends

<sup>38</sup> Ep. 67.<sup>39</sup> Ep. 63<sup>3-5</sup>.<sup>40</sup> Ep. 74<sup>4</sup>.

him some decrees of an African council confirmed by another at Rome.<sup>41</sup> "Let individual cases be examined into," he says, "in accordance with what is contained in a little book, which I trust has come to you, in which several heads of our decisions are collected. And lest perchance the number of bishops in Africa should seem unsatisfactory, we also wrote to Rome, to Cornelius our colleague, concerning this thing, who himself also holding a council with very many bishops, concurred in the same opinion as we had held, with equal gravity and wholesome moderation." In addition to all this we are aware that decrees were passed which were of obligation on the whole Church,<sup>42</sup> and the bishop who should disregard them would be declared guilty of heresy or schism as the case may be and would be punished accordingly. Such was the law to admit lapsed sinners to repentance, for neglect of which Marcian of Arles was to be excommunicated, and the other law admitting lapsed bishops or priests only to lay communion, in accordance with which Basilides, Felix and Fortunatianus were deposed. In the face of these facts who can doubt but that there exists in the Church some supreme universal authority by which its unity is sustained, and uniformity is conserved; and before which must bow down not only the laity and clergy but also the individual bishops. This authority must serve as the real principle of unity for the whole Church, cementing the various parts together; while apart from it we find it impossible to conceive how many separate and otherwise independent churches could by any kindly relations possess such a union as to constitute one compacted and perfected whole. For differences and contentions must arise between the units on points of doctrine or discipline and who is to terminate them if none acknowledges a higher tribunal?<sup>43</sup>

[*To be Continued.*]

CORNELIUS F. CREMIN, S. T. L.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY,  
ST. PAUL, MINN.

<sup>41</sup> Ep. 51<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Ep. 28, 31 and 51<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Ep. 28, 31 and 51<sup>6</sup>.



## ST. MARY'S, BLAIRS.

### THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL ECCLESIASTICAL COLLEGE.

---

Though little known, it may be, outside the circle of British Catholics, "Blairs," as it is familiarly called, is a household word to almost every priest born and bred on Scottish soil; for it has been for well-nigh a century the *Alma Mater* that has cherished and developed the seeds of the priestly vocation of most of their number and fitted them for their clerical course.

The stately pile of buildings near the southern bank of the Dee, about six miles distant from Aberdeen, speaks to those who know the inner history of St. Mary's College, of the triumph of humility and patient sacrifice. For, though flourishing and prosperous now, the Scottish national seminary took its rise from exceedingly humble beginnings, and had to weather many vicissitudes in process of development.

To trace in brief the history of Blairs College, it is necessary to make passing mention of two earlier seminaries whose later union gave it birth. After the disastrous Reformation, Scotland was placed under the jurisdiction of the Archpriests who were at the head of English Catholic affairs, and of the Vicar-Apostolic who succeeded them. Later on, in 1623, local Prefects of the Scottish Mission were appointed. But in 1653 the Sacred College of Propaganda placed Scotland under Prefects-Apostolic, and forty years later erected a Vicariate-Apostolic. Thus, after a century of destitution, Scotland had once more a Bishop of her own. The Rt. Rev. Thomas Nicholson, who was consecrated in 1695 as Bishop of Peristachium, was at the time in banishment at Paris, after undergoing imprisonment for some months both at Stirling and Edinburgh. When, in 1693, he ventured to cross to England, on his way to Scotland, he was again seized and imprisoned in London. When at length he was set at liberty and was able to repair to Scotland, he was compelled to carry out his epis-

copal duties with extreme secrecy and caution. Nevertheless, he labored strenuously for twenty years, traversing during that time the greater part of Scotland, consoling the clergy and their flocks, and administering for the first time since the extinction of the ancient Hierarchy, the Sacrament of Confirmation to the faithful of the country. During the latter years of his Vicariate, Bishop Nicholson had the help of a Coadjutor in the person of Bishop James Gordon, who succeeded him as Vicar-Apostolic in 1718. It was when the failing health of Bishop Nicholson compelled him to relinquish much of the active labor of his Vicariate to his Coadjutor that the first step was taken in the direction of securing a succession of priests for the future service of the Scottish mission. About the year 1713, a small school was started for the elementary training of boys destined for the ecclesiastical state, on an island in Loch Morar, Inverness-shire. The civil war of 1715, however, compelled the Bishops to close it. A year or two later a more successful attempt was made in a small building, little better than a hut, at Scalán in Glenlivet. The project was rendered possible by the absolutely secluded nature of the place, as well as by the fact that it stood upon the estate of the Duke of Gordon, the last Catholic owner of the title, and a son of the illustrious family of Huntly, memorable for its brave profession of the Faith.

Compared with the humblest seminary in these days, Scalán was but a poverty-stricken attempt at an ecclesiastical college, yet, in spite of difficulties and hardships innumerable, it survived for the greater part of a century, and did good work for the Church. Many a zealous priest received his early training in that humble institution; not priests only, but men who were destined to rule as Bishops in after years, were sons of Scalán.

The persecuting spirit which had been aroused afresh by the Jacobite rising in 1745 had disastrous effects upon the little seminary. A more pretentious house, which had been built there, was burned by the English soldiers, after the hasty flight of the occupants. For some time after this, a lamentable

dearth of students, and difficulties in the way of providing teachers, seemed to threaten the extinction of Scalán, even after its buildings had been partially restored. But brighter times came, and Rev. John Geddes, a holy and zealous priest, who afterwards became Bishop, was given the charge of its revival. He built a new house, which still exists, and which was a vast improvement upon its predecessor, although but a rough, moderately-sized farm-house.

About the year 1794, the need of increased accommodation for his students forced itself upon the attention of the illustrious Bishop Hay, then Vicar Apostolic of the Lowland District. After much enquiry, the Bishop was fortunate enough to obtain from Mr. Leslie of Balquhain, a prominent Scottish Catholic proprietor, the lease for 107 years of the farm of Aquahorties in Donside, situated about two miles from Fetternear, the residence of the Leslie family. Here a building was erected at the cost of £1000, intended to serve as a college for 30 students with masters and servants. In July, 1799, the seminary of Scalán was transferred to the new site.

For thirty years Aquahorties served its purpose satisfactorily. The holy Bishop himself, who had from time to time resided at Scalán, made the new seminary his ordinary abode. At the age of 70 he undertook its direction, and until his death in 1811 it continued to be one of his chief cares. The want of funds often caused him much trouble and anxiety. Simple and humble as the seminary still was, the Bishop found himself in frequent difficulties in providing for its support. He was compelled to rely for the most part upon the alms of Scottish Catholics few of whom, at that period, were possessed of any considerable means.

Under the rule of Bishop Alexander Paterson, a successor of Bishop Hay in the Lowland District, a further division of Scotland was made by the Holy See with regard to ecclesiastical affairs. Three Vicariates were constituted, named respectively the Northern, Eastern, and Western Districts. This arrangement, brought about in 1827, remained in force



until the establishment of the Hierarchy by Leo XIII. in 1878. The progress which the Church had made, and which had rendered necessary the new division of the country, directed the attention of Bishop Paterson to the demand for increased facilities in the education of clerical students. The close friendship of the Bishop with Mr. John Menzies of Pitfodels, a prominent Scottish Catholic, opened the way to an advance in that direction.

Mr. Menzies was proprietor of considerable possessions in Aberdeenshire and Kincardineshire, and being the last of his race desired to make the Church his heir. He placed at the disposal of the Bishops the small estate of Blairs, in the latter county, on the opposite bank of the Dee from Pitfodels, to serve the purpose of a national seminary. His generous offer was gratefully accepted.

Blairs was distinguished for having been always in Catholic hands. King William the Lion, in 1187, granted it to the Knights Templars. At the suppression of the Order, Robert the Bruce bestowed the property in question upon the Knights of St. John. From them it passed in 1535 to Gilbert Menzies, Laird of Findon and Provost of Aberdeen, ancestor of John Menzies, and though it was in possession of another family for a time it returned eventually to that of Menzies.

At the period of Mr. Menzies' gift, there were two distinct seminaries in Scotland. When the country had been divided into two Vicariates, in 1731, the success of the little Lowland establishment at Scalan suggested to Bishop John Chisholm, who ruled the Highland District from 1792 to 1814, the expediency of founding a like seminary for his own Vicariate. By means of funds subscribed for the purpose by Highland Catholic gentlemen, he was enabled to carry out his desire. A small college was founded on the island of Lismore, and continued to exist until Mr. Menzies made his offer of Blairs.

The opportunity of carrying on the education of ecclesiastical students on a larger scale made it advisable to unite the two seminaries. This was accordingly done, and in 1829 the students from Aquahorties and Lismore were transferred to the new establishment, numbering in all thirty-five.

The old mansion-house of Blairs, although a roomy building, was scarcely adapted for its new scope. Yet scarcity of means prevented very much enlargement. The chief alterations undertaken were of such a kind as the division of the larger apartments by means of partitions, for the construction of the necessary dormitories, rooms for professors, and the like. A small chapel was erected at the back of the main building, with which it was connected. Provision was made for the accommodation therein of neighboring Catholics. It was an oblong building with a dome surmounting the altar. This latter was of an unusual form; it was really two altars joined together, so that, if two priests happened to be celebrating Mass at the same time, they would face each other. Rows of seats for the students curved round the sanctuary, while the laity were provided with benches at the further end of the building.

No other important additions were made until more than twenty years later. Rev. John Macpherson, the second Rector, who was appointed in 1847, found himself compelled, in view of the greatly increased demand for accommodation, to erect an entirely new wing. In this way the college was rendered capable of housing fifty students. Father Macpherson also improved the little chapel; he caused the incongruous altar to be removed, and another of a more usual form to be substituted. Very few other changes, if any, took place in the external buildings for nearly fifty years.

The life of the students, even a quarter of a century after the foundation of Blairs College, was, to quote the words of a venerable priest, a valued friend of the writer, "almost Spartan in its simplicity." We may well believe that in the earlier days of its existence it was really severe. It was a period when many a Catholic Chapel in Scotland had but a thatched roof and a floor of beaten earth; when the house of a country priest differed scarcely at all from the buildings of the humble farm-houses and crofts which sheltered his flock; when his fare consisted for the most part of potatoes, oat-cake, eggs or fish, with milk for beverage. It was but seemly,

therefore, that those whose lot was certain to be hard should be inured to hardships from the beginning.

Yet life at Blairs, in the old days, severe as it might seem in this age of comparative luxury—with its arrangement for warm baths, its comfortably heated rooms, its appetising, though simple fare, and the ordinary adjuncts of residence even in seminaries for ecclesiastics—was a mitigation of the rigors of the older colleges which gave it birth. Scalan—to give one example—possessed no lavatory whatever, in the building, for the use of the seminarists. Every morning, Summer or Winter, they had to make their way to a barn, some 50 yards from the house, for their ablutions. There, also, one moderately sized room had to suffice for Study, Refectory, and Play Hall. Above it was the Dormitory where from fifteen to twenty youths were accommodated at night.

Food, also, at Blairs, until comparatively recent times, was exceedingly plain. Porridge, milk and oat-cake, comprised both morning and evening repast; flesh meat was provided at dinner on Sundays, and on three days during the week, but for the sake of economy, abstinence was kept on other days. These abstinence days, which lingered on till about thirty years ago, dwell in the memory of former students as periods of real mortification; for the food itself was far from appetising, nor did the cooking tend to improve it. Water was the usual beverage at dinner, but on certain holidays a cup of very "small" beer was given as extra refreshment, accompanied by a cake of white bread, between dinner and supper. The ordinary bread was oat-cake. Tea and coffee were unknown, except on the greatest festivals, when tea, cakes and biscuits were provided as a special feast in the evening, and were accompanied by the rendering of songs and choruses.

This frugality of life, however, did not dispense from a strict attention to study. The course lasted for five years, and perhaps the hardest feature of it was that no ecclesiastical student—for at one time, as at Scalan and Aquahorties, secular boys, the sons of Scottish gentlemen, were received there—was permitted to visit home or kindred. A vacation of a few



weeks was granted in July each year, but it was always spent at the college. Except Holidays of Obligation, and certain fixed half-days and whole days when study was laid aside, work went on uninterruptedly.

For recreation there were the usual games, swimming in the Dee, and occasionally in Summer time, a march altogether for a bath in the sea at a neighboring fishing village. Throughout the year dramatic performances now and again took place, their preparation forming a part of the elocutionary course. The easier plays of Shakespeare, minor comedies, with farces to enliven the proceedings, composed the programme of such entertainments.

Although studies were ordinarily restricted to Humanities, yet in many cases, students received their philosophical and theological training at Blairs. Not a few priests who have proved themselves devoted and competent laborers in the field of the Scottish Mission were entirely educated there. The title of "Heather Priests," by which they were known, was regarded as a proud distinction. But for nearly half a century, the course has been, as a rule, devoted to Humanities alone. Students from Blairs have generally been quite up to the average in classical and general knowledge, and this is not remarkable, considering the capability of their teachers. These were formerly taken, without exception, from the ranks of the Scottish clergy—for lay assistants are of recent institution—yet they have often been men highly distinguished for both learning and ability. A few instances may be here recalled.

Foremost in the list of such illustrious names stands that of Dr. William Smith, who became later Archbishop of St. Andrews and Edinburgh. Dr. Smith was appointed professor of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, almost immediately after his return from Rome, where he had been raised to the priesthood. His career in the Scots College had been a most brilliant one. He had especially distinguished himself for his deep knowledge of Oriental languages and literature. He joined the staff at Blairs in 1843, and for nine years devoted himself to the work

of teaching, laying the foundation of a thorough classical course for the college, and fostering an appreciation for study which has never died out. Dr. Smith's reputation for learning was not confined to Great Britain, but was readily acknowledged on the continent. His great work on the Pentateuch was reviewed in terms of the highest praise in French, German and Italian journals as well as in those of his own land. An instance of the appreciation of his genius in Rome is to be found in the reference to him in the *Osservatore Romano*, on the occasion of his appointment to the Metropolitan See of Scotland, in 1885. "The learned prelate," says that organ, "is well known in Italy through his excellent Biblical writings, and we are certain that his elevation to this high dignity will be hailed with enthusiasm in Scotland, where all through his long ministry he has succeeded in winning the esteem of Protestants as well as Catholics."

Another name worthy of note among the many other able professors who have devoted themselves to the labor of teaching at Blairs is that of the Very Rev. David McDonald. He was contemporary with Dr. Smith, and remained at the college for many years until he was appointed Professor, and later on, Rector of the Royal Scots College, Valladolid; he retired from office about five years ago.

A fellow professor with the above was Rev. William Caven, later a Canon of the Archdiocese of Glasgow. A brilliant student at the Scots College, Rome, he carried off many University prizes and honors. On his return to Scotland he joined the staff at Blairs, and from 1848 to 1864 he gave himself with a whole heart to his work. In 1880 he was raised to the Rectorship of St. Peter's Theological College, at Glasgow, a post which he held for sixteen years. During the greater part of that time he filled also the chair of Moral Theology.

Another Dr. Smith, who now rules the Primatial See of Scotland, succeeded his illustrious namesake Dr. William Smith, in the professorial office as well as in the dignity of Metropolitan. He taught at Blairs for the long period of

twenty-three years, from 1867 until his appointment to the See of Dunkeld in 1890.

Many another name might be recalled here, in connection with this subject—names of holy and learned priests, devoted to the early training of those who were destined to carry on the work of the evangelisation and sanctification of Scotland; but the humility of their lives hid them from the applause of their fellow men, and from the knowledge of all but a few. Their best panegyric is the sterling worth of the Scottish clergy of to-day.

All of those mentioned above were themselves alumni of the college in whose direction they afterwards took so prominent a part. But besides them many students of Blairs have advanced to high places in the Church. Among them may be recalled Bishops Alexander Smith, Gray, Colin Grant, McLachlan—all deceased—as well as nearly all the members of the present Hierarchy.

The national seminary had been quietly and unostentatiously doing its work year after year, braving many difficulties, and in particular that of poverty, in the services it rendered to the Church in Scotland, when it became evident that some effort must be made to bring about the extension and development which the growing needs of Catholicism demanded. The buildings had been constructed to accommodate fifty students, but twice that number might be looked for, could room be found to house them. Many applications had to be refused for want of this. The Bishops found themselves without an adequate supply of clergy in consequence.

Many plans and suggestions were offered as to the means for relieving the difficulty. The late Marquess of Bute, who took so keen an interest in the advancement of the Church in his native land, was desirous of establishing the college at St. Andrews, in connection with the University there, of which he was Rector. The adoption of the plan would no doubt have procured substantial pecuniary help from the Marquess, and would have brought the national seminary into public prominence. The Bishops, however, were of opinion that however



beneficial from an educational point of view, the advantages gained from such a step would scarcely justify the risk of an almost certain diminution in the religious tone of the college, should the students be thrown into an atmosphere so little congenial to the growth of the priestly spirit. The idea was therefore entirely set aside.

Some course of action was, however, imperative. After mature deliberation it was decided to commence the building of a new wing, as the initial step towards an entirely new college. Accordingly, in September, 1892, the first sod for the erection of the proposed addition was cut by the Archbishop of St. Andrews and Edinburgh, the Most Rev. Angus Macdonald. The general plan of the new buildings had already been sanctioned by the Bishops, and with great zeal and energy the recently appointed Rector, Canon Aeneas Chisholm, destined to become a few years later Bishop of Aberdeen, devoted himself to the work of collecting the requisite funds. Such a task is neither easy nor pleasant, and it was some time before the necessary sum was forthcoming. Catholics in the British Isles were aided by their co-religionists in the United States, Canada, and South America; at length through the liberality of a few and the willing help in a humbler way of the majority of subscribers, it was possible to make a start. On July 23rd, 1896, the first stone of the proposed building was laid by the Metropolitan.

The new wing, erected at a cost of £8000, was formally opened on October 13th, 1897, in presence of the Archbishop, some of the Bishops, and a large gathering of the clergy. Two years later the foundation-stone of a new church was laid by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Lennon, Protonotary Apostolic, who had generously undertaken to defray the entire cost. The munificence of the gift was enhanced by the fact that the donor was English both by birth and residence. This was by no means the limit of Mgr. Lennon's benefactions to the new college. When he passed to his eternal reward in April last, his body was, by his own special desire, laid to rest at Blairs.

The completion of the new college was celebrated by a large

gatherings of Bishops, clergy and laity on September 23rd, 1903. The only member of the Scottish Hierarchy absent from the celebration was the Archbishop of Glasgow, who was ill at the time.

Blairs College, as it now stands, consists of an imposing block of buildings, constructed of the fine granite of the district, and occupying three sides of a square. It affords accommodation for 100 students. Its front faces the valley of the Dee. The massive tower over the chief entrance is surmounted by a crown—a feature reminiscent of King's College, Aberdeen, which was founded by a Catholic Bishop, and, like Blairs, dedicated to Our Lady. Towards the east, and connected with the college by a handsome cloister, is the beautiful church, in later Gothic style. It measures 123 feet in length, 35 in width, and 53 in height. Its graceful, slender spire is 150 feet high. The interior of the church is richly decorated in gold and colors. Stalls for the students are arranged choir-wise; an open screen of carved wood separating the choir from the portion set apart for the laity. A fine marble altar has been presented by former students, and a graceful *baldachino*, from the same donors, will shortly complete the gift.

Canon, afterwards Monsignor, Chisholm, LL. D., the Rector, was raised to the See of Aberdeen while the work of building was still in progress. For a few months he retained his office of Rector also, but eventually relinquished it to the Very Rev. James M'Gregor, who still holds it.

Had Bishop Chisholm done no more than erect new buildings at Blairs, he would have merited the gratitude of all Scottish Catholics; for it is a boon of incalculable value to the Church in Scotland to possess so well equipped a seminary for her future clergy. But he did a far greater work. The raising of the external building was but one part of his scheme for the renovation of the entire institution. He recognized the necessity of bringing the college into line with others of a like nature. Much advance had been made by other seminaries in the way of bringing the training of ecclesiastical students up to the level of the more refined tone of modern

social life. It was not sufficient that a priest should be pious and learned, he must also be fitted to take his place with credit in society. The old, vigorous spirit of Blairs, with its rough, hard life, needed polishing, not softening, and this is what Bishop Chisholm during his rectorship of nine years, was able to help forward. The new college gave new life to the successful working of an institution which had deserved well in the past, and was calculated, under improved conditions to render immense benefits to the Church.

As regards the systemised course of studies, much has been done in late years to raise the standard of education to meet modern requirements. In the early years of its existence, as we have already pointed out, Blairs College was able, hampered as it was with difficulties, to turn out many a good classical student, able to compete favorably with those educated in more fully equipped colleges in other countries. In his five years' course, a youth would make a fair acquaintance with Xenophon, Lucian, Sophocles, Aristophanes, and Homer, in Greek, and with Cæsar, Nepos, Livy, Cicero, Tacitus, Ovid, Virgil and Horace in Latin. But in Mathematics, English, and some other subjects the students were less satisfactorily grounded. It was a wise departure, under the new regime, to make the attainment of what the National Educational Department styles the "Higher Leaving Certificate" the aim of the highest class. That the result has been satisfactory is shown by the report of the official examiner who visited the college last year. Some extracts from it will serve to illustrate the standard acquired. Mr. R. K. Hannay reports as follows on the previous year's studies:

"There are several general characteristics of the work which deserve mention. (1) The attention and interest shown by the boys are very satisfactory; there was no trace of wandering or listlessness, and the habit of concentration had been carefully cultivated. (2) There was every indication that the teaching had been sympathetic. The boys were quite ready to answer frankly and at once what they thought. . . . (3) In languages the reading was as a rule fluent and accurate. The oral



answering showed in many cases considerable powers of expression. . . . (4) The work of the different "years" is carefully graded. . . . The course is calculated to give a sound education upon the traditional classical lines. At the same time French and English are well developed and have a good place in the curriculum.

The Latin and Greek of Class IV.—the highest class—were exceedingly good. Passages from Horace, Livy and Thucydides were chosen, and there was some very satisfactory answering, which was both ready and accurate. . . . In French an unseen passage was set for reading, and some pieces of verse were recited. Very creditable fluency was shown, the accent was wonderfully good, and there was no case of marked weakness. . . . In English the answering of this class was very intelligent and appreciative. . . . A little time spent upon Euclid and Algebra with this class showed that these subjects had been well taught. Class III. was asked some rather difficult questions regarding the translation of certain abstract nouns in Latin. The answering was intelligent and interesting. It showed not only good teaching in this language, but also habits of thoughtfulness and reflection."

The report throughout is decidedly favorable. With the lower classes as with the higher the examiner was evidently well satisfied. He notes appreciatively the high standard of the vocal music, and the fact that careful attention is paid to students with musical abilities. "The college buildings," he says, "are admirably suited for their purpose. The boys look healthy. They have been trained in habits of neatness and tidiness. There was a noticeable absence of fuss and noise in their behaviour, and their whole demeanor left a very pleasant impression."

It would be leaving the subject incomplete did we not touch, however lightly, upon a feature of Blairs College which, apart from its scholastic character, tends to enhance its importance in the eyes of Scottish Catholics. It is the national Catholic storehouse of many a priceless treasure of bygone ages. Its library is rich in manuscripts relating to the days of persecu-

tion and to early Post-reformation history, and possesses a valuable collection of books, many of them transferred from the Scots College in Paris. Among other noteworthy relics of the past, Blairs can boast of two splendid original portraits—one of Cardinal Beaton, the other of Mary Queen of Scots. In the newly completed buildings these treasures have found a home more worthy of them than the old weather-stained mansion-house which for over seventy years was dignified by the title of Blairs College.

MICHAEL BARRETT, O. S. B.

ST. BENEDICT'S ABBEY, FORT AUGUSTUS,  
SCOTLAND.

## HOMERIC ARMOR AND MR. LANG.

---

At the beginning of European literature stand two poems dealing with the days when the princes of Hellas drank deep of the 'delight of battle on the plains of windy Troy.' The first is the story of how 'Atreides and Achilles strove.' It tells of the countless woes that sprang from that strife, until their culmination in the death of Patroklos swept the wrath of Achilles into a new channel, where it checked only when the mandate of the king of gods and men forced the hero to restore the dishonored corpse of Hector to the aged father who 'had borne what no other mortal man had ever borne, to raise to his mouth the hand of the slayer of his sons.' The second is the tale of the long-suffering wily Odysseus. Of how he struggled to reach his distant home the rocky island of Ithaca against the dangers of the sea, the might of monsters, the folly of his comrades, the wrath of a god, the magic of a sorceress, the charms of a goddess; until triumphing over all he landed alone upon his native soil to find his home in the possession of the overweening suitors of his wife, at whose hands he must bear insult and injury until the time for the heroic act of vengeance which regained for him his kingdom and his home. To these poems Greek art, Greek literature, Greek religion, and Greek life looked constantly for the embodiment of their ideals. Without Homer there could have been no Greece, and to appreciate fully what this means we must remember what Rome owed to Greece, and the debt of modern civilization to both. An influence comparable with this can be found only in the literatures which the great religions of the world have regarded as their foundations.

How did these poems originate? That is the Homeric question opened effectively for the modern world in 1795 by the famous *Prolegomena ad Homerum* of Friedrich Augustus Wolff, the founder of the modern science of philology. To review even in outline the work which has since been done for

the solution of this problem is no part of my present intention. It will suffice to say that it includes the closest study of the tradition—the readings of mediæval manuscripts, of Egyptian papyri, and the variants contained in ancient quotations from Homer, or reported as the readings of Alexandrian critics; the minutest study of the meter and the language of the poems in the light of the most recent progress of comparative grammar; a keen scrutiny of the stylistic technique of the poems; a most careful analysis of the picture of life presented in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* interpreted by the results of the latest discoveries of archæology and ethnology; and finally the combining of the evidence secured by all these means for the solution of the primary problem. None but a worker in the field can follow this mass of detailed investigation; but there is no reason why the general public should not be kept informed of the nature of the progress that is being made. Only in this way can be kept alive the popular interest which is a support indispensable for the success of any science. If the study of the classics is languishing the tonic is to be found not in preachments upon “The Cultural Value of the Classics in Education” but in keeping before the public the fact that progress of real value is constantly being made in this field of knowledge.

For the Homeric question there is at present no English work which accomplishes this result in anything like satisfactory form. This, in spite of the fact that the Homeric question has appealed to the general English-speaking public with a force and persistency that can be paralleled only by questions which seem directly connected with our spiritual or physical welfare. Still more regrettable is the fact that the book to which the general reader is most apt to turn should be, not an attempt to inform him of the present status of expert opinion upon the Homeric question, but an effort to appeal that question from expert to popular judgment. The mischief to be apprehended is all the greater because the book is written by one of the foremost men in the world of English letters in a sprightly style of polemic which cannot fail to afford amuse-



ment to its readers. There is danger that, in the absence of information, this amusement may pass with some for convincing argument.

The book to which I refer is Andrew Lang's *Homer and his Age*; and at the outset it must be emphasized that it is the representative of a position which we have definitely passed. Causer opens the introduction to his splendid *Grundfragen der Homerkritik* by signalizing the fact that there is no longer an impassable gulf—as there was fifty years ago—between the believers in a single author and the believers in a plurality of authors. After pointing out how even those who would go farthest on the path which Lachmann opened now realize the unity that there is in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and strive to find for it an explanation, he continues: “On the other hand a defender of the unity of the *Odyssey* does not of course assert that Homer, after finishing the *Iliad*, began with the first line of the first book of the *Odyssey* and composed on through the twenty-four books in their present order to the last line of the last book. He will also be compelled to distinguish older and younger parts, and to deny for this or that part authorship by the poet proper; either because he looks upon these parts as spurious and ascribes them to an interpolater, or because he assumes that Homer has here taken an older piece of poetry and embodied it in his own poem with only slight modifications.” An excellent portrayal of the position of modern scholarship of the Unitarian type, but let us see how it compares with Mr. Lang's position. Mr. Lang will admit that a few passages “gravely suspected in antiquity” are interpolations. But, apart from these, he conceives the *Iliad* as produced for the first time by Homer singing night after night to the guests in a prince's house after supper the poem as we now have it from a manuscript which he had himself written, and which he guarded carefully as a trade-secret. The work was a unit, produced at one jet, as is the case with a modern novel. That it may have been the work of one man and still have had a history comparable with the history of the composition of Goethe's *Faust* is a possibility which is not considered; while

the idea that Homer may have embodied in his poems portions of older songs is absolutely rejected. In all this we recognize the extreme of Unitarianism which Cauer rightly declared abandoned by scholars of the present day.

In another point also Mr. Lang is in direct opposition to the present trend of thought. The earlier attempts to analyze the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* into their component parts depended upon the detection of contradictions and inconsistencies in the narrative. That such a method of analysis must leave much uncertainty can easily be appreciated. Apparently contradictions can be removed by psychological interpretations—perhaps too subtle—that convert the alleged blemish into a mark of beauty. Or, conceding the reality of the contradiction, there remains the question whether it is of sufficient importance to warrant the conclusion that it is not a mere lapse of forgetfulness on the part of the author. Here is evidently a large field for the play of subjective impressions. Besides there is the possibility of removing the contradiction by athetizing a few lines. To be convincing such a system of analysis requires the support of evidence of a more objective character, and the gathering of this evidence is the keynote of recent progress. If the *Iliad* is not the work of one man but the outcome of the poetic work of generations, this fact must be evidenced by its reflecting contemporary changes in the language in which it is composed, and in the features of the life which it pictures. At present it is the general belief that different strata of this sort can be distinguished in the poems; and the problem in reality is not whether there exists uniformity or diversity of elements, but how the actual union of the diverse elements is to be explained. Mr. Lang on the contrary will recognize no diverse elements. Throughout he sees an *unus color*, and seeks “to prove that the Homeric Epics, as wholes, and apart from passages gravely suspected in antiquity, present a perfectly harmonious picture of the entire life and civilization of one single age. The faint variations in the design are not greater than such as mark every moment of culture, for in all there is some movement; in all, cases are modified by circumstances.”

For the specialist the book is harmless; and so Cauver very properly simply waives it aside with the remark, p. 267, n. that it "offers no scientific treatment of the problems of Homeric civilization." With the general English-speaking public this attitude cannot be taken; for, such a course is forbidden both by the reputation of the author, and by the attractive style of the book. Nor can the interest of the public be served by general criticisms. On the contrary it seems to me that they demand a detailed exposition of the weakness of the book; and, as it would be a waste of time to attempt this for all parts, I have determined to treat in this fashion the chapters devoted to Homeric armor. These chapters I have selected not because I have anything new to say upon the subject—I stand essentially upon the position of Robert, my constant indebtedness to whom may here be acknowledged once for all—but partly because the discoveries in this field have been especially fruitful, and partly because they are the ones that are most inaccessible to the readers of the *Bulletin*.

I shall begin by outlining briefly the history of the interpretation of Homeric armor. The earliest evidence extant is the work of the vase-painters of the seventh century before our era. They depict the Homeric heroes as armed with bronze helmets, bronze corslets, bronze greaves, and carrying small circular bronze bucklers. This style of equipment we know to have been in vogue among the Ionians of Asia Minor; and we may, without further implications at present speak of it as the Ionic panoply. This type of armor continues throughout Greek pictorial art, and it is also the type depicted by later Epic poets, such as Vergil and Quintus of Smyrna. We have not the faintest indication that the ancient students of Homer had any other understanding of the subject; nor the slightest right to assume that the ancient artists were aware of a contradiction between their own works and the text of Homer that they read. Furthermore up to less than thirty years ago this was the opinion of modern scholarship. One has only to read the translations, given in 1882 by Mr. Lang and his collaborators without comment, to see that Mr. Lang

then took no offense at Ionian bucklers in Homer. I may quote from Mr. Lang himself: "beneath the circle of his shield, the shield covered about with ox-hide and gleaming bronze, that he always bore, fitted with two arm-rods" (XIII, 496); and: "straightway he held forth his fair round shield, of hammered bronze, that the bronze-smith had hammered out, and within had stitched many bulls' hides with rivets of gold all around the circle" (XII, 294); and from Mr. Leaf: "(the shield) that is of gold throughout arm-rods and all" (VIII, 193). Now, however, the round buckler is in Mr. Lang's eyes "manifestly post-Homeric" (p. 142), Homer is "familiar with no buckler worn on the left arm" (p. 2), and in one form or another this assertion runs like a red thread through much of the book. I have, of course, no objection to Mr. Lang's changing his opinion upon what he believed to be sufficient evidence (the extent to which he erred in doing so will be pointed out later); but what I do object to is the tacit assumption that the absence of the round buckler from the Homeric poems is a fact obvious to any one. If Mr. Lang were correct in this, the long and absolute misunderstanding would cry most loudly for an explanation.

In reality the older interpretation of the facts was on the whole much nearer the truth than is Mr. Lang's present position. Indeed as an interpretation of the mind of the man or men who first recited the *Iliad* in approximately its present form it must be pronounced correct. However it is possible to push our interpretation beyond this stage. Thanks to the truly epoch-making discovery of Schliemann in laying bare the monuments of the Mycenaean age, we can now ask, whether portions of the *Iliad* were not understood at a still earlier period in a very different sense. The dawn of the fuller understanding began with Helbig's work *Das Homerische Epos*, of which the first edition appeared in 1884, and the second three years later. Here we find the first recognition of a connection between the mention of long shields in Homer and the peculiar type of shield depicted on the Mycenaean monuments. But the light broke slowly. The construction and handling



of the shield were not clearly understood, nor did the author perceive the bearing of its use upon the rest of the warrior's equipment. When once suggested the idea bore fruit. First, apparently in the brain of Wolfgang Reichel; though in the publication of his results, he was in part anticipated by (1892) Rossbach and by (1893) Kluge. Very significant and appropriate are the words in which the latter formulated his discovery.<sup>1</sup> Beside the bronze-clad warriors in the Ionic panoply "there are wandering" through the battle scenes "invisible even to the poet, ghostlike figures of the past; warriors without corslets, with bare breasts and naked legs. Their *chitons* are tucked up in rolls about their waists where they are held by thongs. Their heads are covered with flat helmets, that protect only the skull. For their body the only effective protection is the long shield, which covers it almost entirely."

In the following year (1894) appeared the first edition of Reichel's *Homerische Waffen*. For the study of the Mycenaean armor the author had enjoyed exceptional opportunities during his work in cataloguing the Mycenaean material which had been brought together in the museum at Athens; and the result of his labor was brilliant—the production of a work that superseded its predecessors and will remain the foundation of our understanding of the subject. In his interpretation of the relation of Homeric and Mycenaean armor Reichel was less successful. Kluge had gone to the one extreme when he regarded the *Iliad* as a work contemporary with the Ionic panoply and describing the conditions of its own times, into which the poet had introduced from older works figures of a bygone day, without perceiving the discrepancies involved. In the enthusiasm of a discoverer Reichel saw Mycenaean armor where it was not, and so went to the opposite extreme of concluding that Homeric armor was Mycenaean armor, and that all apparent references to the Ionic panoply were either to be explained away or regarded as interpolations. A truer insight into the situation was reserved for Carl Robert, who published

<sup>1</sup>I am indebted to Cauer for the quotation.

in 1901 his *Studien zur Ilias*. The characteristic feature of this work is the recognition of the fact that there are on the one hand large stretches of the *Iliad* in which the Ionic panoply is original, while on the other are portions in which there is a curious intermixture of Mycenaean and Ionic armor, besides passages in which the armor is neither properly the one nor the other. This idea Robert worked out in detail, combining to an unusual degree sobriety of judgment with a bold readiness to follow wherever the argument might lead. With the assistance of Friedrich Bechtel he was also able to show in the most illuminating way that these differences in armor ran parallel with certain differences in the Homeric language. The outcome was an analysis of the *Iliad* on entirely original lines. The book was severely criticised—notably by Cauer and by Leaf—as was, of course, to be expected. But in spite of the criticisms, it is my conviction that we shall see with more clearness from year to year that it is the best description of the process by which the *Iliad* reached its present form.<sup>2</sup> Reichel unfortunately did not live to see the appearance of this book. Up to the time of his death he had been working upon a thorough-going revision of his *I Homerische Waffen*, which though incomplete was published after its author's death by Heberdey in 1901 immediately after the appearance of Robert's work.

Such was the status of the problem when Mr. Lang wrote upon it. His discussion is aimed entirely at Reichel's view which had won a convert in Mr. Leaf. Robert's work is not unknown to Mr. Lang for he cites it in one place (p. 115) where he obviously fails to understand what the author says very plainly. In another passage (p. 158), it is the target for a passing sling but otherwise the book is ignored. And yet, it is the very one which Mr. Lang should have discussed; if for no other reason, because Robert's theory is the one most opposed to the idea of an *unus color*.

<sup>2</sup> Only recently (1908) it has received a remarkable confirmation. For in that year Bechtel showed that certain instances of contraction in Homer are either due to metrical necessity or fall within portions of the poems which Robert had shown to be late.

The great principle for which Mr. Lang contends is that poets "of an uncritical age" do not archaize, that "the Homeric poets describe the details of life as they see them with their own eyes." In this contention there is an element of truth. For the present I shall accept it, though we shall later see that for the Homeric poets it must to some extent be modified. We should naturally infer that this principle imposed upon us the duty of ascertaining from the archaeological evidence available what sort of armor Homer could possibly have seen with his own eyes; and, when the evidence seems to exhaust the possibilities, to confine our interpretation of the poems within these limits. To our surprise Mr. Lang is unwilling to be bound in this fashion. For instance we know of no targes<sup>3</sup> that Homer could possibly have seen except the huge targes depicted in Mycenaean art. This is a weapon of very peculiar construction, which is handled in a very peculiar fashion. There is no reason to assume a lacuna in our knowledge, because from the monuments we see clearly that this type of shield was supplanted by parrying bucklers of various forms, which is a perfectly reasonable development. Consequently, when we wish to regard a Homeric shield as a targe, we are, on Mr. Lang's principle, bound to consider it of a Mycenaean pattern, and to accept the limitations which its peculiarities imply. Mr. Lang, however, considers himself free to assume that the Homeric targes are of "indeterminate shape." And so when Mr. Leaf declares that Homeric heroes did not ride "because no man could carry such a shield <as a Mycenaean targe> on horseback," Mr. Lang replies (p. 116), "that men could and did carry such shields <as triangular Norman targes> on horseback"—an answer that must be ruled out until it is shown that Homer saw with his own eyes triangular targes.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> I shall follow Mr. Lang in restricting this word to shields that hang in battle by a strap (τελαμών) from the shoulders of their wearers leaving both hands free.

<sup>4</sup> In passing it may be noted that Mr. Leaf's objection seems in part due to a misunderstanding of Reichel's criticism of the Doloneia. The point is explained very carefully in the second edition of Reichel's work, but is missed entirely by Mr. Lang, which seems strange if we are to understand that he has a first-hand

We must therefore not bedeck our warriors with purely imaginary weapons of indeterminate shape, but we must seek to learn from the archæological evidence the types of weapons which the poet or poets could possibly have seen with his own eyes, and compare the statements in Homer with these and only these. If the statements fit any one type, well and good we have the *unus color* for which Mr. Lang contends. If some statements fit one type and some another, well and good we have no *unus color*, but a diversity of elements for the union of which we must seek an explanation. We have no right to fuse such varying pictures into a composite photograph of indeterminate outline, and maintain that it is 'a perfectly harmonious picture of the civilization of one single age,' which is accidentally not represented for us in the monuments. The poems may (and do) supplement the monuments in detail, but so long as they can be explained from the monuments we are bound to accept that explanation.

The difference between the Mycenaean and Ionian warfare was determined chiefly by the difference in the two types of shields, and fortunately this is the weapon about which the Homeric poems give us the fullest information. To describe the Mycenaean shields clearly without the aid of illustrations is difficult, but may be begun by an explanation of their construction. Two patterns are represented on the monuments side by side, and may pass as "faint variations in the design." For a shield of the first pattern an ox-hide was taken and cut into the shape of a large oblong rectangle with a curved projection at one end. Other ox-hides were cut into the same shape and size and the desired number of layers were stitched together. The shield was then bent into a cylindrical shape over wooden ribs and fastened to them. The precise arrangement of these ribs and the protection of the rim of the shield need not concern us. The hides were then allowed to dry which hardened them and decreased their weight.

acquaintance with Reichel's work. Riding with a Mycenaean shield may not be a physical impossibility, but it would certainly be impractical in battle, and sufficiently uncomfortable under any circumstances.



Shields of the second pattern were constructed in a similar way; but for them the hides were cut to a circular shape. They were then pulled in at points a little above the horizontal diameter, so that the rim of the shield took a shape much like that of a figure 8, only that the loops do not meet in the center and the lower loop is considerably the larger. Viewed in profile the shield bellies out from the rim in consequence of the tension at the point where the rim is drawn in, and thus leaves a space between itself and the body of its wearer. A shield of this peculiar shape could obviously never be plated with bronze in the sense of being covered with a bronze layer; and, while the cylindrical shape does not offer the same difficulty, the added weight would render its plating equally impractical. Mr. Lang is quite right in declaring that there is no archaeological evidence that this was ever done. The monuments, however, do show very plainly that the shield was ornamented by attaching to it metal plates of a size perhaps sufficient to contribute somewhat to its power of protection.

The shield of either pattern was supported by a *τελαμών* or baldrick. Hanging by this it covered its wearer usually from neck to ankle (though sometimes the shield was shorter) and coming around his flanks it covered the whole man very much like a garment. In battle the warrior rested the rim of his shield upon the ground when on the defensive and crouched behind it. If a weapon was aimed at his head, he ducked forward under his shield; if the latter was pierced by a spear, the intervening space still gave him some opportunity of avoiding the blow. If he wished to assume the offensive he could push his shield forward and advance foot by foot under the cover of his shield. When in striking distance he could let the shield swing, and leaping upon his foe try either to pierce his shield or to get at him over its rim. If he did not wish to take this risk he must watch for an uncautious movement of his enemy that would leave some part exposed at which he could strike with greater safety and certainty. If the day went against him and he must flee, the shield was pushed under his right arm and swung so as to cover his back. Even

in the battle it was often in this position; its owner temporarily abandoning its protection in order to have greater freedom for attack or to spoil a fallen foe. When required again a pull with the left hand upon the baldrick would bring it to the front. To do this with ease and swiftness was an important accomplishment for a warrior.

The invention that drove this weapon out of existence was the perfecting of the bronze corslet. Previous to this time the shield had to protect its owner from missiles as well as from blows; but as soon as that function could be entrusted to the corslet, it became clear that the blow could be warded off equally well by a smaller shield carried on the left arm and moved to meet the blow as occasion demanded. Decreasing the size of the shield permitted also an increase of its power of resistance without making it too heavy for use. The left arm to be sure was permanently engaged for defence, but this was more than offset by the additional power for attack given by the increased mobility of the warrior. The consequence was the introduction of the bronze parrying buckler to supplant the Mycenaean targe. Of this various shapes are portrayed but the only one that concerns us is the circular buckler. On the vases this is regularly represented as about a third of a man's height. There is but one vase which seems to represent circular bucklers extending from neck to ankle. We shall have to pause to examine it because Mr. Lang, forgetting that he is convinced that the Homeric heroes bear large targes of indeterminate shape, is also convinced that these impossible bucklers are the shields that (p. 122), "answer most closely to Homer's description." The vase of Aristonothos depicts an engagement between two vessels, on the decks of which stand six men armed with circular bucklers, all represented as coming up to their chins. But, while the bucklers of the men in the vessel to the left cover only their bodies, the bucklers of the men in the other vessel reach almost or completely to the deck. The assumption that any warrior ever used a circular buckler some five feet in diameter would appear to most men unreasonable not only on account of the weight but because of the

useless unwieldiness of the weapon. Hence Helbig and Reichel both take the other alternative and believe that the artist is guilty of bad drawing, of which there is other evidence in this piece of work. Mr. Lang, who is undaunted by the difficulty, objects that "the artist is usually trusted to draw what he sees"; to which the obvious answer is, yes, but never when he draws an impossibility. One fact he overlooks; the bucklers themselves are the same size, the difference is in the height of the men. Trust the artist and you will have to explain the scene as representing half-grown boys defending a ship with their fathers' armor, or some similar situation. In reality Helbig and Reichel are correct, and I think it is possible to explain the bad drawing. The vase-painter wants a symmetrical distribution of the general effect of figures and background. So for instance the mast-head barely rises above the crests of the warriors, because if properly drawn it would unduly invade the upper margin. The height of the shields to the right has in this way been determined by the position of the shields to the left; compare the first and fourth, the third and sixth; the fifth has been forced down to make room for the emblem at the mast-head. Now the vessel to the right has been drawn much larger than the other; either to represent a different kind of ship, or in a crude effort to bring it into the foreground by increasing its size. Space has been lost, and consequently the shields must come nearer to the deck; and it is in this way that the legs of its defenders have disappeared. With them goes the only evidence for Greek circular shields approximating five feet in diameter; and we may rest assured that no Homeric poet ever saw with his own eyes a circular shield over three feet in diameter if indeed he saw any that large.

Coming now to the statements of the poems it must be borne in mind that they do not give systematic descriptions of the armor. Rather they name some quality that strikes prominently the senses, and trust to its associations to bring the whole of the familiar picture to the minds of their hearers. Fortunately for us to whom the pictures are not familiar, there are sharp contrasts between the Mycenaean and the Ionian shields.

1) The Mycenaean shields are targes with baldricks; the Ionic shields are bucklers with arm-rods.

2) The targes are all long shields of the peculiar shapes described; while the only circular shields of which we know are small bucklers.

3) The targes are of leather adorned but not plated with bronze. The only bronze shields of which we know are bucklers; these are sometimes covered with ox-hide, sometimes lined with it, as was the case of the shields found at Olympia.

In all these respects it is easy to show that both sides of the antithesis are represented in Homer, one side in some passages, the other side in others. To be sure there are passages in which both sides are combined, but this does not disprove the reality of the contrast, it is merely the result that we should expect from the operation of known causes to be explained later. It occasions difficulty when we come to explain the union of the diverse elements, but at present we are merely answering Mr. Lang's theory of an *unus color* and for that purpose it is sufficient to show the presence of the diverse elements. Under 1): passages in which there are bucklers with arm-rods have been quoted above. Naturally the baldricks are even more prominent; for instance when Agamemnon (II, 388) pictures the heat of the coming fray, he tells his men that their baldricks shall be wet with sweat; and in v, 796 the prophecy is fulfilled for Diomedes; in xvi, 803 when Apollo breaks the baldrick, Patroklos' shield falls to the ground.

With regard to 2) the shape of the shield: on the one hand we have the epithets *ἀμφιβρότη* the shield 'that covers the whole of a man' as Mr. Lang paraphrases or the shield 'that is about a man' 'man-encompassing' to do more justice to the etymology; *ποδηνεκής* 'reaching to the feet'; and *τερμίοεσσα* a more obscure word, but one for which the meaning 'long' seems definitely settled by the passage from Hesiod which Robert cites. Pointing out how these words describe the Mycenaean shield was like Columbus' cracking of the egg. On the other hand the most frequent epithet for the shield is *παντός* *ἐίση* 'equal every way.' The word *κύκλος* 'circle'



is also used to describe the shield, which is furthermore called *ἐυκυκλος* 'of a good circle' and *διωπή* 'rounded.' Formerly Mr. Lang used to render such phrases by "the circle of his shield" which was perfectly correct, and when interpreted in accordance with what the poet had seen with his own eyes, could mean only a small round buckler. For Reichel's theory these phrases were a great stumbling block and one of his worst errors was the attempt to force them into meanings which could apply to the Mycenaean targe. Thus 'equal every way' became 'well-balanced,' and the epithet 'of a good circle' was supposed to refer to the fact that in the manufacture of the shield the hides were cut into circles. Mr. Lang's treatment of the question is decidedly disingenuous. Instead of holding to his own interpretation and accepting its consequences, he prefers to play off old explanations against new ones, and thus to reach the surprising conclusion: "What Homer really meant by such epithets as 'equal every way,' 'very circular,' 'of a good circle' cannot be ascertained." He is thus enabled to save his *unus color* by assuming that the shields are 'large targes of indeterminate shape.' A few pages later he recovers confidence in his ability to determine what Homer really meant by such epithets and decides that shields which are bucklers something like five feet in diameter are the ones that "answer most closely to Homer's descriptions." "Thus does" Mr. Lang as well as "science fluctuate!"

The description of the material 3) shows the same diversity. Leather shields are at first sight the most prominent; Ajax' shield is 'made of seven bulls' hides,' others are of bulls' hide, or of ox-hide, or strong with hides of oxen. 'Dry and strong ox-hides,' 'well-wrought ox-hides,' are phrases used by metonymy for shields; and the word for 'hide' even becomes to mean 'shield,' and the compound 'hide-bearing,' 'shield-bearing.' When the poet says that the shields are 'fitted with bronze,' or 'varied with bronze,' or 'gleaming with bronze,' or even 'much bronze was hammered upon it' we need understand nothing more than the metal ornamentation shown in the Mycenaean drawings of shields. But on the other hand

the shields of Sarpedon and Aineias (which are unmistakably round bucklers) are of bronze; one lined, the other covered with leather. "Straightway Sarpedon held forth his fair round shield, of hammered bronze, that the bronze-smith had hammered out, and within had stitched many bulls' hides with stitches of gold, all round the circle." "And smote upon the circle of the shield of Aineias beneath the edge of the rim, where the bronze ran thinnest round, and the bull hide was thinnest thereon" and the spear "divided asunder both the circles of the sheltering shield." 'Deiphobos of the white shield' most probably owes his epithet to carrying a bronze shield covered in this fashion with the hide of a white bull. The circle of the shield of Idomeneus also is "rounded with the hides of bulls and flashing bronze," and from the way in which both materials are coördinated, we must understand a buckler like that of Aineias, or of Sarpedon. The shield of Nestor "of gold throughout, arm-rods and all" would be imagined only by a man familiar with shields of solid metal. The inventor of the tale of the seven-leagued boots never saw with his own eyes seven-leagued boots, but was of course familiar with boots of some sort. The same is true of the shield of Achilles: "five folds had the lame god welded, two bronze, and two inside of tin, and one of gold."

Out of this material Mr. Lang makes an *unus color* by supposing an universal armament of bronze-plated leather shields. And with another fluctuation these shields return at least towards, if not to the Mycenaean shape. For we are told (p. 138 f.) that the course of evolution is first Mycenaean shields, and "(2) the same shields strengthened with metal . . . (the Homeric age)," while a comparison with p. 134 shows that 'strengthened' is here but a stylistic variation of 'plated.' Now I have already called attention to the obvious impossibility of 'plating' Mycenaean shields with metal. Here we must further note that there is but one passage in Homer in which shields of such a construction are described. The passage is VII, 220 ff.: "And Ajax drew near bearing his towerlike shield of bronze and seven bulls' hides, which Ty-

chios had wrought for him with much labor, the best of curriers who dwelt in Hyle. He made for him the shield of seven hides, of strong bulls' hides, and upon it he beat the eighth (layer of) bronze." Robert suggests that the bronze layer is smaller than the other seven; a supposition which would do away with the difficulty of the construction, but which is excluded by the very explicit language. There can be no doubt that the poet who first chanted the passage in its present form conceived the bronze as co-extensive with the leather; and as we may be certain that he never saw a targe so built, we must seek to explain the origin of his description. He was familiar with an old poem in which Hector and Ajax met in battle in Mycenaean armor. As he lived in "an uncritical age" he naturally understood it in an uncritical fashion, which in our more critical days would be called misunderstanding it. For him the warriors were clothed in the armor of his own times.<sup>5</sup> This material he employed in his own account of a duel between Hector and Ajax,—Kipling has the right view of the literary ethics of the period:

"And wot 'e thought 'e might require,  
'E went and took, the same as me."

He did not try systematically to bring it up to date; both because he was not a systematic worker, and because he was not aware that it was behind the times. But where he felt that he could improve, he tried to do so. The shields of his times were like those of Sarpedon, and as he conceived the shield of Ajax as of precisely the same shape, he saw no difficulty in

<sup>5</sup>The failure to understand this fact is one of the chief causes of Mr. Lang's misunderstanding of the Homeric question. From his book one would gain the impression that mediæval painters read their bibles with a clear understanding of Jewish antiquities, and then set to work to paint biblical characters in the midst of life as the painters saw it with their own eyes. The misunderstanding I assume in the present case, is actually not so great as it might at first seem. The comparison of the shield with the tower, which guarantees for us the Mycenaean shape of the shield, was probably taken as a mere metaphor, and this would be the most serious. One who considers it improbable should recall how *ἐγχος* 'spear' was understood as 'sword', *κάρπος* 'fruit' as 'wrist' and *τοιοῦ πατρός* explained as *ἀγαθοῦ πατρός* all in the best period.

the addition of an eighth layer of bronze. This seemed to him merely to complete the details of the picture. He gained his object by adding two lines, 223 and 246,<sup>6</sup> of which the second betrays him. Without it the story is clear: Hector "hurled and smote Ajax' dread shield of seven-fold hide. Through six folds went the stubborn bronze cleaving, but in the seventh hide it stayed." With it a considerable amount of casuistry is needed to explain the reckoning: Hector "hurled and smote Ajax' dread shield of seven-fold hide, upon the uttermost bronze the eighth layer that was thereon. Through six *folds* went the stubborn bronze cleaving, but in the seventh *hide* it stayed." Besides the number seven is so prominent in early tales that we should expect a legendary hero to bear a seven-fold shield, not an eight-fold one. Such is the only Homeric evidence for bronze-plated leather targes.

The difference extends also to the action of the poems. For frequently we find the heroes performing deeds which show that they are equipped with shields now of the one pattern, now of the other. Or their actions are described sometimes in phrases which have a full concrete meaning for the Mycenaean shields, but are either entirely inapplicable to the Ionian bucklers or yield for them at most a faint and colorless picture; while other times this situation is reversed. The numerous passages in which the shield is put on the shoulders as if it were a garment need not be cited because Mr. Lang sees this (the Mycenaean) side of the picture. But contrast the Mycenaean description: "And about his shoulders he swung the sword of bronze with silver studs, and next the big stout shield" (xvi, 135), with the Ionic adaptation: "And about his shoulders he swung the sword of bronze with silver studs, and next the big stout shield *he took*, and to a distance shone its brightness like (the brightness) of the moon." Here the comparison is much more beautiful if we think of the shield as a round bronze buckler; and while the comparison alone would not force this conclusion, the context gives abundant evidence for the Ionic panoply in this part of the poem. The

<sup>6</sup> He may also have retouched line 267.



point, however, is that this poet will not have the shield 'swung about the shoulders,' and in another passage (xi, 32), where there is a round buckler, it is said with even greater clearness 'he picked up' his shield. In the "uncritical age" of the interpretation of Homeric armor Mr. Lang felt exactly like these later poets and inserted "he took" in his translation of the first passage.<sup>7</sup>

We can also note the contrast in the way the warriors avoid or parry blows. The Mycenaean style is preserved unchanged in xvi, 610: "But he eying him steadily avoided the bronze spear; for he ducked down forward, and the long spear entered the ground behind him." The same manoeuvre is described in xiii, 404, but as the passage has been retouched, I will not introduce it. Now, as Mr. Lang very properly, though unnecessarily, points out, a warrior with an Ionian buckler can also stoop and let a spear pass over him. It will, however, be most natural for him not to 'duck forward' like the Mycenaean warrior, but to crouch in an attitude approximating the sitting position, a thing which the Mycenaean probably could not and certainly would not do. So when we read, xxii, 274 ff.: "And noble Hector eying steadily (the spear) avoided it. For, seeing it in front of him, he crouched (literally, he sat down); and the bronze spear flew over him, and fixed itself in the ground," we understand not with Mr. Leaf, 'the Mykenaeen posture of defence,' but with Robert a different style of dodging adapted to the Ionic weapons, of which there are other indications in the book. After his shield is pierced the Mycenaean warrior can still avoid the blow: "Through the bright shield went the ponderous spear, and straight beside his flank the spear shore through his tunic, for he had bent aside and avoided black death"<sup>8</sup>; but otherwise

<sup>7</sup>The identical words recur in iii. 334 f. but Mr. Leaf did not fall into the snare. At that time he would probably have explained the passage as an instance of *zeugma*, which could be reproduced in English. This illustrates excellently one of the reasons why all passages were not consistently modernized. Mr. Lang modernized unconsciously, Mr. Leaf unconsciously avoided it.

<sup>8</sup>One line, iii. 358, has been omitted, for reasons to be explained in connection with the corslet.

he can merely trust to his shield to stop the blow. The Ionic warrior crouches and 'holds his shield up and away from him' as is said of Aineias xx, 278, or holds it 'away from him with his stout hand' as Achilles does, xx, 261. Both passages are in an episode against which Mr. Lang has his doubts, and he seems willing to pronounce it 'later'; although there are no 'grave suspicions in antiquity' to warrant his verdict,—unless he has private sources of information. Removing it, however, will not avail, because very similar language occurs in XIII, 163 (in the rehandling of an old Mycenaean passage) against which Mr. Lang has no objection.

Again we have clearly Mycenaean weapons when Ajax' shield is compared with a tower, when Patroklos' shield falls to the ground as soon as his baldrick is broken; when Hector, vi, 115, departed for Troy, "and on both sides the black hide, the rim which ran about the edge of his bossed shield, smote his ankles and his neck"; and when Periphetes of Mycene, xv, 645, turns to flee and trips on the rim of his shield. On the other hand the Ionic bucklers are in other passages equally unmistakable. In xii, 138, the men of Asios move to the attack of the wall 'holding on high' their shields. Yet Mr. Lang tells us: that while Vergil makes Aeneas hold up his buckler borne on his left arm, "Homer, familiar with no buckler worn on the left arm, has no such description." Another instance is in the famous passage of the eighth book, where Teukros takes his position under the shield of Ajax, shoots when his brother lifts the shield, and returns again to its protection. This method of fighting with an Ionic buckler is well illustrated in Greek art; with a Mycenaean targe it is inconceivable. There is no room for the archer either standing, or crouching, between the shield and its bearer; the owner of the shield cannot raise it to a horizontal position, and the archer could not get back under it except on his hands and knees. Had Mycenaean warriors tried to fight in such fashion, it would have been necessary for the shield-bearer to stand a little in front of the archer, and step aside at the right moment. This would have left the archer exposed to missiles shot at an

angle, and would have been described in language entirely different from Homer's description. Several men cannot "hold their shields before" an archer, as the comrades of Pandoras are described doing in iv, 113, unless they are armed with bucklers. It might be objected here, that this is in time of truce, and that the poet is thinking of Mycenaean targes that have been taken off. But xiv, 428 is in the heat of battle, and there too the comrades of Hector, when he is stunned by Ajax, "hold in front of him their round shields." Macaulay imitated the passage:

"But a thick wall of bucklers encompassed him around."

and he understood it rightly. A Mycenaean warrior moves in front of his fallen friend, or straddles him and thus gives him the protection of his shield, as is elsewhere, v, 300, xvii, 132, xiii, 420, described. We hear also three times, xi, 593, xiii, 488, xxii, 4, of troops attacking or awaiting an attack "resting their shields upon their shoulders." Here also we have a 'wall of bucklers.' For the position, left arm forward at an angle of about 45 degrees, and sloping downwards rests the shield arm; while the position would simply hamper a warrior with the Mycenaean targe, without offering any compensating advantage. When Hector awaits Achilles, xxii, 97, he rests his shield upon the projection of a tower, without removing it. Evidently it is a buckler, to support which a prop several feet above the ground is required; the wearer of a Mycenaean targe would simply have grounded it. Finally the difference comes out clearly in the descriptions of the armies as they watch the two duels. In the third book the heroes take off their arms and lay them upon the ground; afterwards they are described as seated on the ground resting against their shields—which would be the natural way to make a huge targe pinched in at the middle contribute to one's comfort in such a situation. In the seventh book the heroes retain their arms, "and their ranks sat close together bristling (v. 1, laden) with shields and helms and spears." Cauer is right in calling attention to the fact that the retention of the armor

in the second case is due to the mistrust inspired by the breach of the former truce. But this does not solve the difficulty. To sit down with a Mycenaean targe slung about one's neck is an utter impossibility. The poet was clearly thinking of men armed with bucklers, otherwise he would have made them stand and ground their shields.

The conclusion is unavoidable: in the *Iliad* there is the contrast between the Ionian round buckler of bronze, and the huge leathern targe of the Mycenaean pattern. Side by side with this we must expect a difference in the corslets. For, we have seen that the invention of a trustworthy corslet was the occasion of the substitution of the light parrying buckler for the unwieldy targe. The supposition nearest at hand is that the forging of the bronze corslet, which is not represented in the Mycenaean monuments, constitutes this invention. This is the view that Reichel took, and by his theory he was therefore driven into the necessity of explaining away all the Homeric allusions to bronze corslets, or of regarding them as interpolations. One consequence was the inconsistency of supposing a more thorough-going modernization for the corslet than for the shield. This is a point on which Mr. Lang harps; but as it does not affect our point of view (we recognize the new shields as well as the old) I shall pass it by, although something could easily be said in Reichel's defense. More important were Reichel's errors in attempting to interpret *θώραξ* 'corslet' as 'armor' and *χαλκοχίτωνες* 'bronze-vested' as 'clad in bronze-ornamented shields.' With perfect correctness Mr. Lang rejects these errors—as Robert had done before him. But having once recognized bronze corslets Mr. Lang is obliged by his theory of an *unus color* to find bronze corslets everywhere, and it is at this point that we must join issue with him.

It is at once evident that if the warriors are regularly conceived as wearing bronze corslets, there are a surprising number of passages in which weapons pass through them without any mention of the obstacle encountered. Mr. Lang therefore assumes that while metal corslets are universally worn, they



are not "practicable" breastplates, but merely "flimsy" pieces of armor, the piercing of which is not worthy of mention. In itself the theory is improbable enough. We can hardly conceive of men possessing the skill to make bronze breastplates and remaining for a length of time without the power to render their corslets 'practicable' by making them of thicker metal. Or, even if such a period did exist, the only result would be that the new "impracticable" armor would not come into use. That more practical body armor already existed in the shape of linen, felt or leather jackets worn in conjunction with a broad metal plate around the waist will afterwards be shown. The new "impracticable" breastplates would be a great and useless expense. Besides they would greatly impede if not absolutely prevent the manipulation of the Mycenaean targe. This, is must be remembered is shifted frequently from front to rear and vice versa. The bearer does this by reaching with his left hand under his right arm-pit to grasp the baldrick, and stiff metal plates across back and breast would interfere seriously with the operation. When Mr. Lang recalls the fact that Norman knights wore metal corslets and still carried targes, he ignores the fact that they handled their shields in a different fashion and that they had to encounter much more efficient weapons of offense.

However, we need not stop with these general considerations. Let us see whether the bronze corslets of Homer are really flimsy and impracticable. Mr. Lang rests his case on the number of times that a weapon crashes through a corslet, as opposed to the few times that the corslet saves its wearer. He forgets to allow for the fact that in Homeric battles the narratives of deaths and wounds are much more frequent than are the accounts of escapes. I have made no calculations but feel confident that the proportion of cases in which a shield stops a weapon cannot be very much greater. Besides Mr. Lang glides somewhat too lightly over the opposing examples. The arrow which is stopped (XIII, 586) to his surprise, is not spent, but fired at close quarters. The corslet that saved Meges (xv, 529) from a spear which had, to be sure, already been thrust

through his shield, is described as *πυκινός* 'firm' or 'compact'; and a good deal of space is wasted on the description of this 'defence against foemen,' if it is a flimsy piece of armor that could be pierced 'more easily than a pad of paper.' The corslet of Paris "is pierced by a spear which has also perforated his shield, though the spear came only from the weak hand of Menelaos (*Iliad*, III, 357)." Yet in the same situation the strong hand of the Telamonian Ajax is stayed by a corslet (XXIII, 819), and Diomedes rather than take this chance prefers to fence for the exposed neck. It would be useless to say that this happens in a mere game; the game is surprising enough, but both princes are playing it for all it is worth. When Achilles is face to face with Hector he does not find the corslet so flimsy that he can disregard it, but he must needs strike at the opening at the throat. Nor is Apollo content with the blow that deprives Patroklos of spear and helm and shield; he deigns—in our text at least—to loose the fastenings of this insignificant piece of armor. Besides there are the general descriptions of the battles in which we hear of the bronze ringing on the breasts of the warriors as they smote one another, and we cannot imagine that each blow drew blood. The corslets we may conclude are perfectly practicable even if not impenetrable. It remains to be seen whether they are universal.

That this is not to be expected, must be clear from what has preceded; the best proof that it is actually not the case is to be gained from passages, for which it is possible to show that the mention of the corslet must be a later addition. Of these one of the clearest is III, 357 ff. in the account of the duel between Menelaos and Paris. "Through the bright shield went the ponderous spear, and through the very artfully wrought breastplate it was driven; and straight beside the flank it shored through the chiton, for he (had) bent aside and avoided black death." As the text stands it must mean that after the spear entered the corslet, its wearer was still able to double up sideways, and so avoid the spear. Mr. Lang seems to be alone in finding this a 'very natural motion.' Helbig thought

it could be explained, but only on the *ad hoc* assumption of a very wide corslet. Reichel and Mr. Leaf and Robert all very properly pronounce it an obvious impossibility. Now the cause of the whole difficulty is in one line "and through the artfully wrought breastplate it was driven." Take out this line and we have a vivid picture of a warrior without breastplate avoiding a spear after it has penetrated the targe which is some distance in front of his body. The same language recurs in the account of the duel between Hector and Ajax; and a somewhat similar difficulty is caused by this same line in the account of the wounding of Odysseus in the eleventh book. "Through the bright shield went the ponderous spear, and through the artfully wrought corslet it was driven, and from his ribs it tore all the flesh" is in itself unobjectionable; but, when a little later we hear that the hero "pulled the spear from his flesh and bossed shield," the fact that the corslet is unmentioned awakens our suspicions against the recurrence of this line. Again in v. 97 ff. we read: that Pandaros bent his curved bow against the son of Tydeus, "and shot him as he was rushing on, hitting him on his right shoulder,—on the plate of his corslet; and through it flew the bitter arrow, and it held on its way straight through, and his corslet was sprinkled with blood." What follows the dash is the rendering of two lines, which could be dropped without harm to sense or meter; let us see whether their presence does not entail incredible difficulty. Sthenelos leaped from the chariot, and taking his stand by the side of Diomedes "pulled the swift dart straight through and out from the shoulder, and the blood shot out (like a spear) through his *streptos chiton*." Without minimizing the difficulties of interpretation of the word '*streptos*,' I must protest against the way in which Mr. Lang takes advantage of them to reduce the whole matter to a "clash of learned opinion," that exempts him from a serious consideration of the difficulty. Aristarchus, who is followed by Mr. Ridgeway, recognized some sort of chain or scale armor; the interpretation is probably wrong; but, even if correct, it would leave a contradiction with the preceding lines which indicate

unmistakably a corslet consisting of breast and back plates. Mr. Leaf looks upon the word as a colorless epithet 'pliant,' which accords with the metaphorical uses of the word. Studniczka saw a reference to a peculiar mode of weaving in which the threads were given an extra twist. The last interpretation seems to me correct, and it may be that this method of manufacture gave to the cloth extra strength, turning the *chiton* into a sort of linen corslet. But, at all events, as the text stands we have some sort of a *chiton* worn under a breastplate and a backplate. And with this the narrative is impossible. We cannot believe that the arrow went through breastplate, shoulder and backplate; nor can we believe that the elaborate process of cutting the shaft of the arrow, removing the corslet, and extracting the weapon is designated by the words "he pulled the swift dart straight through and out from the shoulder." Yet if the hero is wearing a corslet such as indicated in the two questionable lines, one or the other of these interpretations must be given. Besides the second passage describes the 'shooting out' of the blood when the arrow is drawn, as if the wound had not bled until then; while in the first passage the corslet is already spattered with blood.<sup>9</sup>

Furthermore, as Mr. Leaf says, "it would be strange if the blood were said to spurt through the tunic concealed by the breastplate while the visible breastplate itself is passed over in silence." Mr. Lang attempts to cut the knot in characteristic fashion (p. 160); the passages must agree because no interpolator would be guilty of a contradiction in so short a space. This is—to adapt one of Mr. Lang's phrases—the fallacy of a modern interpolator, and amounts to abandoning the interpretation of the passage. Remove the two useless lines which mention the 'plate of the corslet,' and the difficulties disappear. Diomedes is wearing merely a *chiton*, the arrow passes through the muscles over the shoulder,<sup>10</sup> the closing of the wound about

<sup>9</sup> Doerpfeld's suggestion approved by Reichel that this refers to blood trickling along the shaft is impossible. The arrow was shot from a distance and must therefore have been dropping; and from the depth of its penetration must have remained at this angle. The blood would therefore have had to trickle uphill.

<sup>10</sup> This is the most likely place for the wound which is annoying but not disabling. With a metal corslet an arrow striking so near the edge would probably



the shaft prevents bleeding until the arrow is drawn,—an accurate description surgically. The removal of these lines is confirmed by a later passage. Athene finds Diomedes (v. 794 ff.) standing by his chariot and cooling his wound “for the sweat under the broad baldrick of his man-encompassing shield vexed him,—therewith was he vexed and his arm was weary,—and he raised the baldrick and wiped away the black blood.” Clearly there is no corslet.<sup>11</sup>

In another passage the difficulty is stylistic. It is at the turning point of the action of the *Iliad*, the death of Patroklos, and is one of the most sublime passages in the poems. In order that the difficulty may be felt with full force it is necessary to quote the whole context. Patroklos had thrice charged the Trojans and had slain at each onslaught nine heroes: “But, when for the fourth time he rushed on like a god then did appear for thee, Patroklos, the end of life. For Phoebus met thee in the mighty battle—a dreadful god. And Patroklos did not mark him coming through the throng; for, wrapped in thick mist, the god met him and took his stand behind him, and smote him on the back and broad shoulders. And from his head Phoebus Apollo struck the helmet, and it,—the helmet with four *phaloi*, eye-like pipes—rolled and rattled beneath the feet of the horses, and its crests were defiled with blood

glance, we should therefore naturally understand a lower wound with penetration of the shoulder-blade. This adds to the difficulty. That the poet is silently presupposing the arrow to pierce the breastplate and come out through the armhole of the corslet, need not be discussed.

<sup>11</sup> The passage causes a difficulty of its own by seeming to imply that the wound is now on the left shoulder. Mr. Leaf believes that the baldrick is on the right shoulder, which is contrary to what we know of the manipulation of the Mycenaean shield, and to other passages. Reichel separates the two actions, the lifting of the baldrick to ease the left shoulder from the weight of the shield, and the wiping of the blood from the wound on the right shoulder to cool it. This seems to me very artificial. A slip of memory on the part of the poet might seem to some not improbable, but I prefer to regard the text of l. 98 as corrupt. On account of their metrical equivalence *κατὰ δεξιὸν ὤμων* can easily have taken the place of *κατ’ ἀριστερὸν ὤμων*. Whether this is purely mechanical, or whether the Ionic interpolator of lines 99–100 reflected that the buckler covered the left shoulder, and that he was making the wound more serious by shifting it to the right, need not be decided.

and dust. Before this it was not permitted for the helm with crest of horsehair to be defiled with dust [but it kept the head and fair countenance of the godlike man Achilles; but then Zeus gave it to Hector to wear upon his head, for his destruction was near at hand.]<sup>12</sup> And the long-shadowed spear shivered in his hands, the spear heavy, and long, and stout, and tipped with bronze. But from his shoulders to the ground fell the long shield, baldrick and all. And blindness seized his mind, and his shining limbs were loosed beneath him, and he stood bewildered."

In this description everything is the effect of the staggering blow dealt by the god. It burst the strap of the helmet, the baldrick of the shield, and shivered the spear—"Such is the force of more than mortal hands." Is it not the greatest anti-climax to find added in our texts: "And king Apollo, the son of Zeus, undid his corslet," especially as it would hardly be unfair to render "unbuckled his corslet?" Notice also how bald the addition is. Helm, shield and spear—the complete equipment of the Mycenaean warrior—each have their epithets, and we are told what becomes of each. For the new weapon there is none of this, and we find instead a useless repetition of the name of Apollo, and his parentage. Reichel was the first to explain the cause of the difficulty, but he was not the first to feel it. It is interesting to observe how Pope—a greater poet than this interpolator—corrects the fault:

"his ample shield  
Drops from his arm ; his baldrick strows the field :  
*The corslet his astonished breast forsakes :*  
Loose is each joint ; each nerve with horror shakes."

and how Mr. Lang strove in his translation to conceal the flaw by beginning a new paragraph at his point.

These passages support one another, and make it certain that for parts of the poem, the warriors wear no metal corslets. When we have this fact in mind the meaning of other passages

<sup>12</sup>The words in brackets are an addition, but the point is not essential to the present argument. I have also dropped from the translation one line.

stands out with greater clearness. Agamemnon tells his heroes that the baldricks of their shields shall 'sweat' them; clearly there is to be no metal corslet between baldrick and man. Again, when Hector hits Ajax with his spear "where the two belts—one for the shield, the other for the silver-studded sword—were stretched across his breast, and they saved his flesh," the poet has evidently no corslet 'flimsy' or otherwise in mind. In XI, 99 f. we read: "and them Agamemnon king of men left there, their breasts gleaming when he had stripped off their *chitons*," and it is impossible to believe that the stripping of the corslet has been passed over in silence.

How are we to conceive the clothing of the bodies of these warriors who wear no metal corslets? The monuments show men wearing a sort of loincloth which is held in place by a metal band. The latter we will do best by conceiving as a broad band of metal which would serve as a protection for the abdomen, and would resemble the ones found in Italy. The fabrication of such a piece of armor could be accomplished by bronze-smiths who were still unable to forge corslets; and we can readily imagine situations in which it would be of service. In short it was thoroughly practical, as long as the metal corslet was unknown. This article—loincloth and band really constitute a pair—is to be recognized in the *ζῶμά τε καὶ μίτρη* of Homer. We do not hear much of them it is true because the Homeric hero generally wears a *chiton* over them, and the poet limits his epithets to qualities that strike the senses. But both are brought to light when the surgeon sets to work to treat the wound of Menelaos, and we hear of the loin cloth on the occasion of a boxing match. The *μίτρη* can of course be called by the more general term 'girdle' *ζωστήρ*, and under the one or the other of these names its piercing is mentioned quite frequently (v. 534 ff., 615, 856 ff.; XII, 189, XVII, 517 f.). The wearing of the *chiton* is also represented on the monuments, though not so frequently as in the poems. As it was mostly a long garment it was girded up with a leather belt which would also be called *ζωστήρ*. Whether the loincloth and metal girdle were retained under it was probably a matter

in which custom varied; the retention being the more general, as we once find the peculiarity of 'wearing the *chiton* without a *mitre*' noticed. Indeed the wearing of the *chiton* was itself for a time a matter of choice, as is well pictured in the old tale which was the foundation for Odysseus' feigned exploit. "Now all the others had cloaks and *chitons* and slept in peace, with their shields as wrappings for their shoulders. But I in my folly had left my cloak with my companions—for even so I had not expected to be cold—and had followed with only my shield and my loincloth" (*Od.*, xiv, 478 ff.). Such a man could properly be called *αἰολομίτρης* 'with gleaming *mitre*' an epithet which occurs once in the *Iliad* (v, 707). The next step was to strengthen the *chiton*, either by weaving it in a particularly stout fashion, or by making it of a different material—felt or leather. In the latter case it would be a 'piece of armor for the chest' *θώραξ* rather than a *chiton*. There are two passages, which can best be understood by assuming a *thorax* of this description, xx, 413 ff. and iv, 132 ff.; the latter is the more detailed and its discussion alone will suffice. Athene guided the arrow to the place "where the golden buckles of the belt held (the corslet) together, and where the corslet was double against the blow. Upon the firm belt the bitter arrow struck; through the artfully wrought belt it drove, and through the very artfully wrought corslet it pushed, and through the *mitre* which he wore, a protection for his body, a barrier against missiles; it guarded him the most, but on even through this it sped. And the arrow grazed the surface of the hero's flesh." After Robert's suggestion that the corslet is a felt one, and that its being double is due to the pleating under the girdle, the passage, formerly a famous *crux*, requires no further comment. It is also clear then why the bronze *mitre* should be the most efficient protection, and why afterwards the corslet is no obstacle to the treatment of the wound. Archæological evidence for the use of such felt or leather jackets is found in monuments of the late Mycenaean period.

The treatment of the helmet in Mr. Lang's book is very



brief, and recognizes only the bronze helmet. The presence of such a helmet is sufficiently guaranteed by the phrases *κόρυς χαλκείη*, *κυνέη χαλκοπάργος*. Of these the last 'the helm with bronze cheeks' indicates unmistakably a helmet like the 'Corinthian helmet,' which was a metal casing for the entire head. The face of its wearer was covered completely except in front, where the cheeks of the helmet did not meet. Opposite the eyes the opening runs further back so as to permit the owner to look sideways, but it was also partly closed by a piece projecting from the forehead to cover the nose. We can understand how such a helmet is said to be 'fitted to the temples,' and how when a head is shorn off it rolls away in its helmet. But we cannot understand how such a helmet could be struck from the head of its wearer by a sword blow (xiii. 576) nor its being fastened with a leather chin-strap, as is the helmet of Paris in the third book. These we must understand as felt or leather caps, with a rim of bronze running like a 'crown' around the head of their wearer. Such helmets are represented in the Mycenaean monuments where they are adorned not only with crests, but also with hornlike projections with which are to be identified the *φάλοι* and *φάλαρα* of the Homeric descriptions, which touch when the heroes are standing in close array. They are either horns or metal imitations of them, and their resemblances to the antennae of insects is probably the key to the understanding of the epithet 'pipe-eyed' which is applied to the helmet. The difference comes out also when a man is wounded in the head,—except in the case of wounds about the eyes or mouth which were left uncovered by both styles of helmets. Thus Patroklos strikes Euryalos on the head with a rock, and his head 'burst within the strong helmet,' but when he strikes Kebriones in the same fashion on the forehead, 'the stone crushed together both his eye-brows, nor did the bone stop it but his eyes fell to the ground in the dust.' Evidently one hero had a metal helmet, the other was struck on his bare face. A bronze helmet may be pierced with a spear, but a bronze sword will not hew through it, as the sword of Achilles does through the helmet of Echeolos (xx, 475). When a spear

strikes a helmet 'with bronze cheeks' we hear: "nor did the bronze helmet stay it, but the spear rushed through it and broke the bone"; but when the helmet has a *phalos* or *stephane*, or there are indications of other Mycenaean weapons, the spear strikes nose or forehead without encountering any obstacle, or after piercing the *stephane*. Sometimes also the ear is unprotected and here it is better to understand a Mycenaean helmet, rather than to suppose that the poet is passing over in silence the penetration of the helmet, especially when the next man slain is wearing a Mycenaean helmet.

Metal greaves go with the round shield and the bronze corslet. For the Mycenaean warrior they are useless on account of the length of his shield. What he requires are leather gaiters as a protection against the rubbing of his shield. In *κνημίδες* we have a word that could apply to either, and the question is how is it to be interpreted. Reichel would recognize only the leather gaiters, Mr. Lang will see everywhere bronze greaves. Mr. Lang is nearer the truth; wherever the greaves are mentioned, they are of metal. In one passage we hear that the Achaeans are 'bronze-greaved' (VII, 41), and when Hephaistos makes Achilles greaves of tin—at that time a precious metal—we shall infer that the poet was familiar with metal greaves, on the principle which we applied to Nestor's shield of solid gold. Elsewhere we hear merely that the greaves are beautiful and fitted with silver clasps. But Mr. Lang should also show that these metal greaves are universal, whereas in reality they are pieces of armor which are very rarely mentioned. Only once (XXI, 292) does a weapon hit one; otherwise they appear only when a hero puts on his armor (III, 330; XI, 17; XVI, 131; XIX, 369) or when the armor is being forged (XVIII, 459, 613). Then they are coupled as closely as the language can with the metal corslet. Besides this the Achaeans are called (thirty-one times) 'well-greaved' which must be understood as implying the bronze armor. Usually this epithet occurs in passages that are acquainted with Ionic weapons, that it sometimes has got into older parts which otherwise describe Mycenaean weapons is due to a process of modernization to be explained later.

Looking backwards we find not an *unus color* in the description of the armor but a diversity that is at first sight surprising. There are huge Mycenaean targes of leather, and round parrying bucklers of bronze; besides the possibility that there are bucklers of the late Mycenaean pattern which cannot be more exactly identified. The warriors wear on the one hand the *mitre* sometimes without but more usually with the *chiton*, and occasionally beneath a felt or leather corslet; on the other hand we find them in other passages wearing the *chiton* alone under bronze corslets that consist of breastplate and backplate. Their heads are sometimes encased in bronze shells, at other times covered with bronze-rimmed caps which leave their faces bare. Sometimes they put on metal greaves, in other places we hear nothing of such armor. It might occur to some one that the *unus color* could be saved by supposing the poet to describe the age in which the Ionic panoply was supplanting the older weapons. For certain passages this would be possible but for the *Iliad* as a whole such a supposition would shatter on the way that the weapons are distributed. For instance in the last six books of the *Iliad* the weapons are almost exclusively Ionic, and the exceptions also fall close together. In xx, 407 ff. is told the killing of Polydorus who is wearing a felt corslet; and in xx, 472-477 two heroes with Mycenaean helmets fall before Achilles. Apart from these passages the weapons described are always Ionic. We can only conclude that the authors of these books were men who saw the Ionic panoply with their own eyes, and described what they saw; while one of them adapted parts of an older poem to his own purposes.

The *unus color*, therefore, for which Mr. Lang contends cannot be saved. The diverse elements are unmistakably present and amount to far more than 'faint variations in the design of a perfectly harmonious picture of the civilization of one single age.' The *Iliad*, then, could never have been thrown off at a single jet by one man who was describing life as he saw it with his own eyes, in total independence of his predecessors. Rather must we conceive it as the outcome of a

process of development which began when the Mycenaean armor was still in use and did not reach its conclusion until after that style of equipment had been supplanted by the Ionic panoply. If we would understand the nature of this process we must observe the way in which the diverse elements are combined. While there was question only of showing the actual presence of the diverse elements, I have purposely ignored this side of the question, but it is now time to bring it into the foreground. Hitherto my procedure has been to emphasize the existing contrasts by pointing first to one side of the picture and then to the other. This could easily lead to the idea that the Mycenaean and the Ionic elements, like oil and water never mix. Reflection will show that we could expect such a result only if we were to assume that the *Iliad* is an almost purely mechanical collection of substantially unaltered independent lays, and this would be returning to an extreme Lachmannian position. The unity which does pervade the *Iliad* forbids such a hypothesis, and consequently compels us to expect a partial fusion of the Mycenaean and the Ionic elements. The processes of this fusion must be understood, because the result is to obscure at points the distinction between the two styles of armor.

In the first place words change their meaning, and consequently epithets coined to describe the Mycenaean armor are also applied in a new sense to the new weapons. 'Made of bulls' hide' could be understood by a man of the later period as applying to a shield only in the sense that it was lined with leather, and once it seems to be so used. Thus the phrase 'the man-encompassing shield' was afterwards felt to be merely an 'ample shield' and in this sense the adjective is twice applied to shields that are obviously round; and the helm 'with four *phaloi*' seems once to be taken as the helm 'with fourfold crest.' Again descriptive adjectives may be substantivized as designations for an object and as such remain in use when the description would no longer apply to the changed construction of the object. In this way *κυνέη* '(a cap) of dog's skin,' and *τρυφάλεια* '(a cap) having four *phaloi*' have come in Greek to



mean simply 'helmet' even when made of bronze and without *phaloi* at all. The Greek word for shield irrespective of its material is *σάκος* but its Sanskrit cognate *tvac* 'skin' shows the origin of the designation. In this case the original meaning has been lost in Greek, but that its preservation does not necessarily prevent the acquisition by a word of a secondary meaning is a well known fact. The classic example is the German *Feder* meaning both 'feather' and 'pen.' Fully comparable with this is the use of *ῥινός* 'hide' for 'shield' even when the shield is of bronze. All this is in no wise surprising to a student of language, and could be illustrated in abundance from later epics such as the work of Quintus of Smyrna. The result is the appearance of a veneer of Mycenaean coloring over the Ionic portions of the poem; and in our interpretation we must be on our guard against taking this appearance for a reality.

In the second place we must remember that we are arguing as if we had the text of the *Iliad* in the shape in which it first reached its present extent. Now we are fully conscious that this is not the case. All of the manuscripts that we have, and all of the manuscripts of which we know anything, go back to an Attic edition of Homer of about the time of Peisistratos. Between this and the time when the *Iliad* first appeared in approximately its present bulk is an interval that we need not attempt to estimate exactly. Even for the period since Peisistratos our manuscripts and quotations show a sufficient fluctuation in the text between phrases which seem about equally well adapted to the context. The matter may be illustrated from Leaf's commentary to the first hundred lines of the first book. Line 5: 'and made them a prey to dogs and all birds' or 'and made them a prey for dogs, and a feast for birds'; line 47: 'like unto night' or 'wrapped in night'; line 69: 'Calchas the son of Thestor' or 'a prophet, the son of Thestor'; line 73: 'he with good intent harangued and spoke among them' or 'he answered him and spoke winged words'; line 97: 'he will not ward off unseemly destruction from the Danaans' or 'he will not withhold his heavy hands from the pestilence.'

In the descriptions of armor this force will act always in one direction; the more familiar, the better understood Ionic epithets will take the place of the Mycenaean. In some passages the change takes place almost under our eyes. In v, 797 our manuscripts read: 'the sweat under the broad baldrick of his *round* shield was vexing him.' The baldrick and the absence of the corslet guarantee that the shield was Mycenaean; the epithet alone contradicts. But Eustathios has preserved the true reading: 'of his man-encompassing shield,' the two epithets being metrically exactly equivalent. Again in three passages the manuscripts vary between 'well-greaved Achaeans' and 'princes of all the Achaeans.' In these passages the variant is not of importance, but it shows how the phrase 'well-greaved Achaeans' may have crept into strata of the poems which are older than the invention of greaves. The duel in the third book is fought with Mycenaean weapons,—recall the trouble made by the intruding corslet, the fact that the sword shivers on the *phalos* of a helmet, and that the helmet has a leather strap—yet, when Paris arms himself, our texts have the regular Ionic 'run' for such occasions. "First he put about his shins his beautiful greaves, fitted with silver clasps; and second he put on his breast the corslet of his brother Lykaon, and fitted it to himself. And about his shoulders he swung his bronze sword with silver studs, and next <he took> his great stout shield; and on his valiant head he set his well wrought helm with crest of horsehair, and terribly from above nodded the crest. And he took a stout spear which fitted his hands." Zenodotus, however, it would seem knew another version; "And about his shoulders he swung his long shield; and on his valiant head he set his well-wrought helm with crest of horsehair, and terribly from above nodded the crest. And he took a stout spear which fitted his hands." This version is not only absolutely Mycenaean, it is, furthermore, adapted to the present situation, for Paris is already wearing a sword. It is unimaginable that Zenodotus could have invented anything so good, so that we must believe that he has preserved the true text.

If we can see the substitution going on in the time after Peisistratos, we may be confident that the same force was at work in the period between his time and the completion of the *Iliad*. Whether we look upon the tradition at this time as written or oral is unessential; the difference would be only one of degree. Finally, the same result must have been brought about during the composition of the *Iliad* if that was a process of gradual growth. And all the more certainly because the characteristic Ionic epithets 'a shield equal every way,' 'a helm with bronze cheeks,' 'with *chitons* of bronze' 'with goodly greaves,' were then so many cries of triumph over recent achievements, which the poet would be most willing to embody in his work. Consequently when a shield is clearly marked as Mycenaean, and still termed 'equal every way' we can only conclude that one of the known metrically equivalent Mycenaean epithets has been displaced by this Ionic term. In this way the corslet has occasionally been brought into the poems instead of a helmet or *zoster*. The principle also explains the difficulty occasioned by the use of *θωρήσσειν*, *χαλκοχίτωνες*, *ἐνκμνήμιδες* in the older parts of the poems. About fifteen passages are thought by Robert to come under the last rubric, and while one may argue about the individual applications it is impossible to dispute the validity of the principle, or to look upon the use made of it as excessive. We see then that there actually is a coating of Ionisms over the Mycenaean parts of the poem.

And, finally, we are brought back to the question of whether the Homeric poets archaize. For this principle must be called in to explain certain portions of the poems, notably the twelfth book, where, despite unity of style and action, the weapons change from Mycenaean to Ionic and back again in kaleidoscopic fashion. Mr. Lang, as we have seen, rejects the proposition *in toto*, while I have already indicated that I consider it necessary to distinguish before replying. As usual Mr. Lang will see only the two extremes of the question. Either the poets must ransack the temple treasures and conduct archaeological explorations in a nineteenth century quest for local color-

ing, or they must know and describe only what they see with their own eyes. This is quietly premising that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are at the very beginning of Epic poetry, while no student of the Epos can doubt any more than Cicero could that there were poets before Homer. The fact is writ plain in the language of the Epic, the evidence of which Mr. Lang 'confessedly and regretfully no grammarian' fails to appreciate. The mixture of Aeolic and Ionic, of older and younger forms in the Homeric dialect points indubitably to the following facts. Greek Epic poetry began with poems in the Aeolic dialect. These poems were taken over by the Ionians and Ionized, not systematically and with intention but involuntarily, by the substitution of the contemporary Ionic forms wherever this produced no disturbance of the meter. Ionians then composed epics in this mixed dialect, with the unavoidable consequence that the forms of their contemporary dialect obtained a wider range in their poems. Whether any parts of the poems we have were composed in the period of the pure Aeolic poems is a separate question. The point to be made here is that on the hypothesis of a single author *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were written in an artificial dialect, and the method of Homer's work differs only in degree from that of Apollonius of Rhodes or of Quintus of Smyrna, or of a modern Englishman who would compose a Border ballad. On the hypothesis of a plurality of authors the same will be true for some of them; or for all, if it be denied that any part of the existing poems goes back to the period of the beginning of the Epos.

The point is important because it amounts to saying that Homer or some of the Homeric poets were deliberately archaizing in the matter of language. And this carries with it further implications. The taking over of conventional epithets, phrases, formulae, and 'runs' must to a greater or less extent be permitting one's language to think and speak for one. If its voice is the voice of a bygone age, the result can easily be a discrepancy between the life described and the life seen, although the author has not striven to produce this effect. Indeed the author may remain unconscious of what he has done



especially when the old objects and the new have the same name in spite of their changes of construction. This was the case in regard to the armor. The older poets had sung of shields and *chitons* and girdles and helms, and these were still familiar names for familiar objects. What was to warn the later poets that the construction and use of these objects had changed? We can see their dependence on the past in the colorlessness of their treatment of the weapons for which their models fail them, the greaves and the corslet.

So far we may speak of unconscious archaizing and the reality of its occurrence in the Homeric poems is indisputable. Must we not go further and assume that hand in hand with the attempt to reproduce the language of the past went some effort to picture its conditions of life. Such was the opinion of Aristarchus. Wilamowitz Moellendorf could see no other way to account for the slight mention of writing in the poems, and Eduard Meyer supposed for similar reasons that the poets purposely ignored the political geography of their own times. Mr. Lang, to be sure, assures us, p. 3, that "it is only writers of the last century who practise this archæological refinement." The position is so extreme that he must afterwards recede from it and recognize, p. 106, near the beginning of our era "a careful archaiser" in Quintus of Smyrna. The truth is that it is again a question of degree. Previous to the nineteenth century we find artists guilty of what seems to us incredible anachronisms, because our understanding of what is possible or impossible at a given time, has been vastly sharpened by the progress of the historical sciences during the last century. In consequence of that progress we demand more of our artists in this respect, they strive more to meet the demands, and we have come to derive a peculiar pleasure in seeing these demands fulfilled. Archaizing to this degree cannot, of course, be expected of an ancient poet, and so Mr. Lang properly says that Quintus archaizes unsuccessfully, meaning, of course, when he is judged by modern standards. But between successful archaizing in our modern sense and describing only what one sees with one's own eyes, are many stages. The practice of Quintus

and the theory of Aristarchus both show that some degree of the art was familiar to the ancients, and we may reasonably expect to find some traces of it in a literature which marks the close of a long period of literary development. Only we must not expect to find the art highly developed and practised to the same degree by all the artists of the period.

The diverse elements are present, and this forbids the extreme of crude Unitarianism. The opposite extreme is forbidden by the complexity of the fusion of these elements. To show this much was the purpose of the present article, and here I must let the question rest. Even to run through the *Iliad*, and point out where the Mycenaean weapons are found, and where the weapons are Ionic would demand more space than is at my disposal. And if it were possible to present it, an analysis made in this fashion on the basis of a single criterion would be too one-sided to be offered as an indication of the process by which the *Iliad* reached its present form. Differences of a similar nature are observable in the descriptions of other phases of life, in the style and above all in the language of the poems. The successful analysis must be supported by the cumulative evidence of all such criteria. That there is still considerable diversity of opinion between the workers in the field is true and is proof of the complexity of the problem. That the range of this divergence has been narrowed by the elimination of both extremes is also unmistakable, and therein lies the progress which has been made. To imagine that the 'industry and erudition' of critics for over a century has been simply dissipated in illogical speculation, and that the true solution of the Homeric question is to recognize that there is no Homeric question and so return to the pre-Wolffian hypothesis—genuine tradition it is not—of a single author is what Mr. Lang would try to induce the general reader to do. If the present article will help to show some that the path so marked out leads straight to error, its writer will feel repaid.

GEORGE M. BOLLING.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

**La religion de l'Ancienne Egypte** par Philippe Virey. Paris, Beauchesne et Cie, 1910, pp. vii + 352. Fourth volume of the *Etudes sur l'histoire des religions*, published by the same firm.

Like the volume of Fr. P. Dhorme this book is made up of lectures given at the Institut Catholique de Paris. The author is an Egyptologist of long standing and excellent repute, well known in particular by his monographs of Theban tombs published in the fifth volume of the *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique au Caire*. In these lectures the author does not pretend to give a complete and systematic exposition of the Egyptian religion in all its manifestations, but rather a general view of the religious ideas which obtained at various periods in the land of the Pharaohs. He is fully conscious of the difficulties that beset any one attempting to solve such problems as the concept of unity or multiplicity in divinity, the meaning and power of sacrifice, the origin of animal worship and polytheism; yet in those problems are we chiefly interested. We are glad undoubtedly to know when, where and how the Egyptians worshipped, what names they gave to their innumerable deities, under what forms they represented them, how they symbolized their attributes. Still, those are after all secondary questions. The religious thought, its genesis, its evolutions, its influence on the organization of the state and on the individual man, that is really what we want to know, and we feel grateful to the author for having devoted to those questions six out of the seven lectures of which his book consists. In spite of the many citations which are given both in the Egyptian text and script and in French translation, the book reads well and will prove both attractive and useful even to students of general culture. Its attractiveness is enhanced by numerous well selected illustrations and its usefulness by an excellent analytical table of contents. We cannot close this brief review without extending to the Institut Catholique de Paris, our sincere congratulations for having secured for its students the

coöperation, even though, merely *en passant*, of so competent lecturers as Fr. P. Dhorme and Dr. Ph. Virey.

H. HYVERNAT.

---

**Aretas IV. König der Nabatäer**, eine historisch-exegetische Studie zu Kor, 11, 32 f. von Dr. Alphons Steinmann, professor am. Kgl. Lyceum Hosianum in Braunsberg. Freiburg i. B. Herder, 1909. 8o., pp. vi + 44 pp., \$0.27.

Having established, on the strength of the Nabataean inscriptions published by J. Euting, that Aretas IV. reigned from 9 to 40 A. D., the author proceeds to demonstrate the identity of this king with the Aretas of 2 Cor. XI, 32 f. and prove that he had come into the possession of Damascus in 37 A. D. by a gift from emperor Gaius. Appealing then to Galat. I, 18, the writer shows that three years must have intervened between St. Paul's conversion and first visit to Damascus and his flight from that city. The consequence of this all is that St. Paul's conversion must have taken place between 34 and 37 A. D. The year 34, however, is inadmissible, as it is not likely that such a persecution as the one in which St. Stephen suffered martyrdom could have been carried on by the Sanhedrin while Pilate (died 35 A. D.) was living. The author therefore concludes that St. Paul's conversion took place between 35 and 37 A. D. This conclusion is not new. Professor Steinmann knows it, but the argumentation as a whole is novel and well conducted.

H. HYVERNAT.

---

**Des Palästinische Arabisch.** Die Dialekte des Städters und des Fellachen. Grammatik, Uebungen und Chrestomathie, dargestellt von Leonhardt Bauer. Zweite, vollständig umgearbeitete Auflage (with a preface by G. Dalman). Leipzig, Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1910. 8o., pp. x + 210.

Although the author does not state for what class of students primarily he wrote this book, it is clear from the way it is gotten up that it is chiefly intended not for mere tourists or pilgrims,



but rather for such as wish to come in close and protracted contact with the various populations of Palestine, with a view of ascertaining their manners, customs, traditions and legends. In other words Dr. Bauer's grammar is primarily an introduction or a key to ethnological research, or Palestinology, as we might say. From this point of view the book will interest but a restricted number of our readers. However, its usefulness is not limited to this. The study of the living representatives of any family of languages is, as is well known, of the greatest assistance to students of historical and comparative grammar. As a rule we can see with but little difficulty how those languages have evolved the form in which they appear, and by analogy we may often conclude as to the rules which govern the growth of the ancient idioms of the same family, especially of such as obtained in the same lands, even though they should not belong to the same group. This is in particular the case of Hebrew and Palestinian Aramaic. It has long been remarked that while the study of ancient Arabic is absolutely necessary to ascertain the starting point of their morphology, a knowledge of modern Arabic dialects is just as useful to understand how they come to that stage of evolution in which they crystallized.

As for intrinsic merit, Dr. Bauer's work is far superior to any previous work on Palestinian Arabic dialects. He has been more systematic and more perseverant in gathering and sifting his materials, and has more judiciously distinguished from one another the dialects spoken in the cities and those spoken by the peasants and the beduins. The Arabic is given all through the book in transliteration only. A very good feature of the exercises is that they are graded not so much according to the regular order of the sections in the grammar, but according to the relative usefulness those sections have for the beginner. All exercises and the whole chrestomathy (narratives, conversational sentences, popular songs) appear both in Arabic text on one page and in German translation on the opposite page. This, however, hardly justifies the absence of a vocabulary, and we are glad to read in the preface that the author intends to publish a dictionary to supply this defect.

H. HYVERNAT.

---

**The Papacy and the First Councils of the Church.** By Rev. Thomas S. Dolan. St. Louis, Herder, 1910. 12mo., pp. 189. \$.75 net.

The High Church Anglicans delight to call themselves Catholics, and in their liturgical worship and minor devotions show a striking conformity to the Church of Rome. Only one thing is needful for their union with the true Church of Christ, and that is their recognition of the primacy and infallibility of the Holy See. One of the grounds on which they base their attitude of independence is the contention that papal supremacy and papal infallibility were unknown in the early Church, that they received no recognition in the first six ecumenical councils.

It is to show the unsoundness of this contention that Father Dolan has written this little volume. Reviewing the first six ecumenical councils in chronological order, and making use also of the direct and indirect testimony of the minor synods of this period, he presents a mass of evidence in favor of papal primacy and infallibility that ought to bring conviction to every well disposed mind. At the conclusion of his survey of the Sixth General Council, he rightly says: "We may say without fear of successful contradiction, that if there is any phenomenon at present existing in the world, which bears any likeness to the Church of the seventh century, as it is pictured at the close of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, that phenomenon is beyond all legitimate question the Roman Catholic Church."

In treating of the condemnation by this council of Pope Honorius for heresy, he agrees with Dom Chapman that Honorius was rightly condemned on account of the heretical language he used in his letter to the patriarch Sergius, but that such a view, privately expressed, does not impugn papal infallibility, which is exercised when the Pope, as head of the Church, solemnly defines a doctrine of faith or morals binding on the consciences of all the faithful.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**Heaven's Recent Wonders, or the Work of Lourdes**, from the French of Dr. Boisserie. Authorized Translation by Rev. C. Van der Donckt. New York, Pustet, 1909. 8vo., pp. 385. \$1.50 net.

The present volume is the fifth book that Dr. Boisserie has written on the marvellous cures and graces that have been vouchsafed to the faithful through devotion to our Lady of Lourdes. Of his competency and trustworthiness there can be no doubt. He is a physician in high standing. He has generously given his services for many years to the work of verifying the wonderful cures at Lourdes. Most of the cures he relates have come under his personal observation. His testimony is thus first hand, and it is the testimony of an expert. His book has much in common with that of the Abbé Bertrin on the same subject. In the latter, the story is told with greater literary skill and has more dramatic interest. But the present work is of great value for its carefully documented accounts of recent cures, and for the insight it gives into the rigorous, conscientious verification of the more noteworthy cases of divine healing. This rigidly scientific investigation is conducted by the Bureau of Verifications, of which Dr. Boisserie is the head. Only about one-tenth of the cures reported in the religious periodicals of France are set forth in the official annals of the bureau. Many of these are of so extraordinary a kind that unbiased physicians have confessed themselves baffled to give them a purely natural explanation. It is interesting to observe that in an age when writers who call themselves Christian are rejecting the possibility and evidential value of miracles, highly intelligent observers are being led to embrace the Catholic faith by the evidences of God's miraculous power which they see at Lourdes. Two notable cases are mentioned by Dr. Boisserie, that of Dr. Piou, who is now a Redemptorist, and that of Dr. Longo, who was formerly an anarchist and is now a Franciscan. The book is illustrated with a large number of prints, unfortunately of so inferior a quality as to form a painful contrast with the excellence of its written contents.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

**Jésus, quelques traits de la physionomie morale de Jésus**, par M. Meschler, S. J. Traduit de l'allemand par l'abbé C. Lamy de la Chapelle. Paris, Beauchesne & Cie, 1910. 16mo., pp. 169. 1 fr. 50.

This little book aims at increasing our love and admiration of our blessed Lord by setting forth, on the basis of Gospel evidence, the moral and intellectual greatness of the divine Teacher. To this end, the author dwells on four salient features in His life-work—His notion and teaching of asceticism, His method of religious instruction, His social relations with the different classes of His people, and His public preaching. The references to the Gospels are apt and abundant. Priests will find in this little work an interesting and useful book of meditation.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**Une conversion de protestants par la Sainte Eucharistie**, par E. Abt, S. J. Paris, Beauchesne & Cie, 1910. 12mo., pp. 106. 0 fr. 80.

In this booklet, the author tells the story of his parents' conversion to the Catholic faith. They were both Protestants of the extreme pietistic type, and were led from one religious extravagance to another till they found lasting peace of soul in Catholicism. The final impelling motive to conversion was the keenly felt desire for frequent communion, for which no opportunity was given in the Lutheran Church. Once converted to the Catholic faith, they labored zealously for the conversion of others, and were instrumental in bringing nearly forty of their friends and acquaintances into the true fold. Of their children two became priests, and one an Ursuline nun. It is an edifying instance of the wonderful way in which God makes His grace felt among men.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---



**La Resurrection de Jésus**, par l'Abbé E. Mangelot. Paris, Beauchesne & Cie, 1910. 12mo., pp. 404. 3 fr. 50.

Within the last two years, the Abbé Mangelot contributed a number of articles on the Resurrection to the *Revue Pratique d'Apologetique*. These articles he has retouched and arranged in orderly series to form the present volume, adding by way of supplement two careful studies on the Crucifixion and Ascension of our blessed Lord. The object the author has had in mind is to vindicate the reality of Christ's bodily resurrection in the face of modern unbelief, especially of that kind which rests its pretensions on critical grounds. To this end, he makes judicious use of the data accredited by biblical criticism, and refuting step by step the objections of critics like Loisy, Le Roy, Harnack, Pfleiderer, Lake and others, he establishes the truth of Christ's resurrection, first by the testimony of St. Paul, and then by that of the Gospel writers. The work is thoroughly up to date, gives evidence of wide and careful reading, and is a silent refutation of the assumption, so common among present day skeptics, that belief in the bodily resurrection of Jesus is incompatible with sound scholarship.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

---

**Das Leben des Heiligen Symeon Stylites**, in gemeinschaft mit den Mitgliedern des Kirchenhistorischen Seminars der Universität Jena. Bearbeitet von Hans Leitzmann, mit einem deutschen Übersetzung der Syrischen Lebensbeschreibung und der Briefe, von Heinrich Hilgenfeld. Leipzig. Hinrichs, 1908, pp. vii + 257. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. 3 Reihe, 2 Band, Heft 4.

In many respects this is a model piece of biography, though of a kind possible only when the materials are on such a restricted scale as in the present instance. The subject is dealt with in four sections. In the first there is a critical edition of the texts which serve as sources for the life of St. Simeon. In the second the value of the various texts and the later biographies of the saint are studied and appraised. Next there is a discussion of

the chronology of St. Simeon's life, and lastly a complete biography of the saint drawn from the sources themselves in which most of the questions at issue are gone over and analyzed. The work will form a useful addition to the lucid study of the Stylites by the learned Bollandist Père Delahaye, and will place the student of early Christian asceticism in a position to study with ease and certainty the first and greatest example of the heroic method of renunciation practised by the Pillar Saints. A sufficient guarantee of the thoroughness with which the work is done is afforded by the fact that it is included in the *Texte und Untersuchungen* of the Prussian Academy. The biography of this saint which the authors themselves have prepared, though not long, is adequate. It is refreshing to find that after modern criticism has had its say the Simeon of tradition remains the Simeon of history.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**Didyme L'aveugle.** Par Gustave Bardy. Paris, Gabriel Beauchesne & Cie, 1910. 8o., pp. xii + 279.

The position which Didymus the Blind, head of the Catechetical School in Alexandria during more than half a century, should hold in the history of theology is a subject which has occupied the attention of many scholars of late. It is with a view to settling this question that this new study of the life and works of Didymus was undertaken. Though it takes up the same questions which were discussed by Leipolat (*Didymus der blind von Alexandrien*, Leipzig, 1905) its usefulness is manifest as well from the different method followed as from the fact that new conclusions are arrived at. A short biography, short because of the lack of available sources, precedes a detailed examination of the authenticity of the works attributed to Didymus and his teaching regarding the Trinity, Redemption, the Church and the Bible. These are followed by chapters on the learning of Didymus and his attitude in the Origenist controversy. The conclusions of M. Bardy are at variance with many of those of his predecessors. Though he admits that Didymus exerted a great personal influence on many of his contemporaries, he refuses to the Alexandrian Theologian any credit for shaping Christian theology, and says if

he possessed originality it is found only in the cleverness with which elements borrowed from his contemporaries were grouped and systematized. It is not likely that all the author's conclusions will pass unchallenged, but the discussion will serve to direct attention to one of the most interesting figures among Christian theologians.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**L'Art, la religion et la renaissance:** Essai sur le dogme et la piété dans l'art religieux de la Renaissance italienne. Par M. L'Abbé Bronssolle, Aumonier du Lycée Michelet. Paris, F. Tequi, 1910. 80., pp. xvi + 496 avec 139 illustrations dans le texte.

The work consists of a series of eight lectures which were delivered last year in the course of Apologetics at the Catholic Institute in Paris. Its apologetic character is twofold. There is a defence of art in general and especially of religious art and an attempt to show that a study of the art of the Italian Renaissance affords many valuable arguments to the apologist who aims at a more thorough appreciation of that period. In vindicating for the art of the Renaissance the merit of being truly religious, the author aims at showing that it is free from the reproach of naturalism and paganism, and that entering into the service of religion it derived its motives from the Christian ideas. The method which is followed is not an analysis of the works of the great artists so much as a study of how they dealt with Christian themes. From the manner in which Our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, the Holy Eucharist, etc., are represented, the author arrives at the conclusion that the Christian apologist is by no means obliged to abandon the art of the Italian Renaissance, and that making all due allowance for its imperfections it did good service to religion. The illustrations, each accompanied by an explanatory note, are in most cases on a scale entirely too small to aid materially in elucidating the text. Whatever may be thought of some of the conclusions which are arrived at, there can be no doubt but that a sincere effort has been made to find the meaning of the masterpieces of the Italian artists. It seems strange that the

author did not refer to Ruskin, who has dealt sympathetically with the same theme in some of his works.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**L'Angleterre chrétienne avant les Normands.** Par Dom Fernand Cabrol. Paris, Victor Lecoffre (J. Gabalda & Cie.), 1909. Pp. xxiii + 341.

This useful summary of the early history of Christianity in England will not disappoint those who are acquainted with the writings of the learned Dom Cabrol. The limitations imposed on him by the editors of the *Bibliothèque de l'enseignement de l'histoire ecclésiastique*, did not permit of any extended discussion of the many controverted and controversial subjects connected with the founding of the Church in England. His purpose seems to have been rather to point out the influence of Christianity in moulding and developing English institutions rather than to give a detailed narrative of the various processes and personages by whose instrumentality this was accomplished. Hence it is that very little space is devoted to the Celtic Church in Britain, which will be more properly dealt with in a separate volume. As usual there is an excellent and really helpful Bibliography.

---

**Etude critique et littéraire sur les Vitae des saints mérovingiens de l'ancienne Belgique.** Par L. Van Der Essen. Louvain, 1907. Pp. xx + 447.

In this study there is a detailed literary examination of the lives of about eighty saints of the early Belgian church. The obvious advantage of the method, by which the lives of the saints in certain localities are brought together in one work, is still further developed here by the method of division according to dioceses. The work is one of a collection published by the members of the historical and philological seminar of the University of Louvain.

---



**Histoire des Conciles.** Par Charles Joseph Hefele. Nouvelle Traduction Française faite sur la deuxième édition Allemande corrigée et augmentée de notes critiques et bibliographiques. Par Dom H. Leclercq. Tome III. Première Partie. Paris, Letouzey et Aîné, 1909. Pp. viii + 600.

The high standard of excellence which marked the first volumes of the new French translation of Hefele is maintained in this. Hefele's famous work is indispensable to the student of church history and Leclercq's notes and bibliographical references are indispensable to the reader of Hefele.

---

**Storia Sociale della Chiesa.** By Mons. Umberto Benigni. Vol. I. La Preparazione, dagli inizi a Constantino. Milan, Francesco Vallardi, 1906. Pp. xxiii + 449.

This is a comprehensive and valuable study of a phase of Christian history which has hitherto not received the attention it deserves. In two sections the author deals respectively with the teaching of Our Lord and the Apostles, and the social life of the early Christians, including under the latter rubric a discussion of the political life, the ethico-juridical life and the economic life of the Christians in the pre-Constantinian church. The timeliness of the work and its special usefulness in view of the current theories of so many historians of the materialistic school, ought to commend it to students outside the Church as well as to those of the fold. It contains an excellent Bibliography.

---

**L'Avenir du Christianisme.** Première Partie. Le Passé Chrétien, Vie et Pensée. Par Albert Dufourcq. Paris, Bloud et Cie., 1908. Pp. xxvi + 330.

The apparent paradox in the title of this work can be understood only by reference to the author's philosophy of history as set forth in the Preface, which enables him from an examination of the past, to know something of the *origines de la chrétienté de*

*demean.* This volume contains a study of the great religions of antiquity, which, the author points out, gradually drew closer to a common type and assumed a certain kind of unity, as a preparation, under divine Providence, for the Christian religion. It is no small achievement to have succeeded in presenting in such small compass a problem so vast as this, but the task imposed the necessity of dealing at times in generalizations which will not always be clear except to students of comparative religion.

---

**Germany in the Later Middle Ages. 1200-1500.** By William Stubbs, D. D. Edited by Arthur Hassell, M. A. Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1908. Pp. x + 255.

While this work contains much that could hardly have escaped change or excision at the hand of the author himself had he lived to prepare it for the press, it is not, as so many posthumous writings frequently are, a reproach to the reputation of the author. It is the second volume of a series of lectures dealing with the history of Germany from 476 A. D. to the close of the thirteenth century. The period was one which Bishop Stubbs was eminently qualified to discuss. The author confined himself to the national aspect of German history and touches on imperial affairs only incidentally.

---

**Etude sur les Gesta Martyrum Romains.** (Tome deuxième. Le Mouvement Légendaire Lérinien.) (Tome Troisième. Le Mouvement Légendaire Gregorien). Par Albert Dufourcq. Paris, Albert Fontemoing, 1907. Pp. xii + 302 and ii + 329.

In those two volumes M. Dufourcq continues his examination of the manner in which the Gesta of the Roman Martyrs assumed their traditional form. The painstaking manner in which the various acta are resolved into their constituent elements and the certainty with which the contents are analyzed, render this work worthy of a place in the front rank of hagiographical studies.

---

**Heortology.** A History of the Christian Festivals from their origin to the present day. By Dr. K. A. Heinrich Kellner. Translated from the second German edition by a Priest of the diocese of Westminster, 1908. Herder, St. Louis. Pp. xviii + 466.

No work in the field of ecclesiastical history has appeared in recent years in English which is more deserving of attention than this, and none has yet been published in any language which surpasses Dr. Kellner's in the clearness and brevity with which all the facts of importance regarding the liturgical year are set forth.

---

**Les Martyrs.** Vol. VIII. La Reforme (1573-1642). Par Dom H. Leclercq. Paris, Oudin et Cie., 1908. Pp. 488.

This volume of "authentic texts concerning the martyrs" deals with the Reformation period. While France, Scotland, Poland and Japan are represented, England claims first place with her long list of victims under Elizabeth and James I.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

### Probation.

Dr. Charles F. McKenna, Vice-President of the New York State Probation Commission and well known for his activity in the child-saving work of the St. Vincent de Paul Society in New York City, lectured at the Catholic University on the 26th of May upon the subject of "Probation."

He defines it as a system of correction designed to improve the character of an offender by giving him his liberty under friendly and coercive oversight as a substitute for punishment.

It follows in some respects the Catholic doctrine of penance in that the State, drawing from some treasury of reserved mercy, assumes the position of an offended father who is quite willing to forgive the erring child, exacting only the acknowledgment of guilt and only the mere form of punishment, if he is truly repentant and has honestly formed a purpose of amendment. The punishment may be nothing more than the mere promise to visit the Probation Officer or to do some other little thing which he may require. If these essentials are present in criminal cases in Court there will be success in the practice of Probation. It appeals to the humanly weaker elements in the culprit, because escape from pain and punishment and the continued enjoyment of liberty constitute a great happiness—the more appreciated the closer had been the danger of the pains and the prison penalty. Then again, the conviction is driven home that the continued enjoyment of this happiness depends ultimately upon the perseverance in good conduct.

Probation was first recognized by statute in Massachusetts in 1878. The first establishment of it in New York State by statute was in 1901. Prior to 1900, only six States had Probation Laws; to-day the system is authorized in thirty-seven States and in the District of Columbia. In New York State there were in 1905 about two hundred Probation Officers, only a very few of them active and only one receiving a salary as Probation Officer from public funds; there were, in 1909, 454 holding official appointments, 65 of these being salaried under the title and the appointments they held as such.



He gave an interesting talk upon the practical working-out of Probation in the Magistrates' Courts, the Children's Courts and County Courts. He is an advocate of the improved method of treatment in the cases of children who, when being tried and about to be found delinquent, are adjudged by the Court to be in need of the care and protection of the State. By this means, the actual brand of criminal for a child is avoided; more often the prosecution of the delinquent parent or guardian results.

### **Careers Open to Men of Science in Technical Fields.**

Dr. Charles F. McKenna of New York City, who lectured on "Probation" on the 26th, also addressed the students in the School of Science on the following day at the invitation of Very Rev. Dean J. J. Griffin, upon the careers open to men of science in technical fields.

Dr. McKenna, although giving much time to Catholic sociological work, is a busy man in his own profession as a Chemical Engineer. He is President of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers and Chairman of the New York Section of the English Society of Chemical Industry.

He gave the students his views on the opportunities of labor for them in study and practice of applied science, this being based on over thirty years of experience in chemical technology. He drew a vivid contrast between the state of the great industries producing staples in the 70's and 80's and their present condition. He had seen the growth in the consumption of sugar from 700,000 tons per annum to 3,000,000 tons per annum. He had followed the extraordinary growth of the steel industry and he had seen Portland cement grow from an unknown article of manufacture in this country to a production of 70,000,000 barrels per year. He reviewed the history of other great American industries.

He outlined many of the things that ought to be expected from the extensive use of electrical energy. He quoted from Governor Hughes on the New York State Water Supply Commission, to show that in New York State alone there is water power going to waste which would be worth a rental of fifteen million dollars a year and would furnish the living for, indirectly, over one-half a million people. He believed that the development consequent upon the utilization of water power in this country will so modify

the industries both as to location and process, that a vast army of scientific men working in practical and in research ways will be called for to cope with the problems and activities.

### University Alumni Association.

HISTORIAN'S REPORT, JUNE 7, 1910.

BY REV. GEORGE V. LEAHY, S. T. L., '93.

According to an article of the Constitution, as yet, I believe, unrepealed, it is the duty of the historian "to chronicle matters of particular interest in the life of the University and of the members of the Association, and to make a report of the same at the annual meeting." For opposite reasons the two tasks of the historian are this year somewhat perplexing. News from the University itself, transmitted through the *Bulletin*, has been of late unusually rich and varied. News from the alumni, on the other hand, has been sparse and meagre, owing doubtless to an excess of modesty. A dozen alumni in different sections were importuned to forward information that might be utilized at the present meeting, but, with few exceptions, they gave answers of a general nature, but little helpful to the historian. Your scribe was assured, for example, that "the graduates of the University are doing excellent work in the vineyard of the Lord," this particular phrase emanating from Father John Lynch of the diocese of Albany.

The phrase, however, cannot in this instance be regarded as merely a stereotyped formula. It has been confirmed from so many different quarters that it may be accepted as a literal expression of the truth, and on the basis of these assurances, the historian is pleased to bring back word to his Alma Mater that her sons have continued this year their former worthy traditions and, whether as priests or lay apostles, have done work of notable excellence in the vineyard of the Lord.

Besides this general record, there are, fortunately, some particular items of information that redound to the credit of the alumni and the honor of the University. In the archdiocese of Baltimore, Father James F. Nolan, a student at the University from 1890 to 1892, has been made Rector of Corpus Christi parish in succession to Mgr. Starr. In the diocese of Syracuse,

I am told that Father James P. McPeak, who won his baccalaureate in 1905, was appointed Chancellor last October. In the Paulist Congregation, Father John J. Burke, who received the S. T. B. in 1899, has been chosen a Consultor of his order, meantime continuing his solid and meritorious labors as editor of the *Catholic World*.

In my own little corner of the world, New England, that makes small showing on the map but is acknowledged to stand fairly high in its own conceit, many of the alumni occupy places of more than ordinary importance. In Connecticut, Father Peter H. McLean, licentiate of the class of 1895, has remained head of the Missionary Band for the long term of twelve years. In the Springfield diocese, Fr. James J. Donnelly, S. T. B., 1892, has been for some two or three years permanent rector at Fitchburg in succession to Fathers Feehan and Garrigan, both now bishops. And in the Providence diocese, Father Austin Dowling, S. T. L., 1892, has been serving efficiently for an equal term as rector of the Cathedral.

In the archdiocese of Boston, the few changes that have occurred are of minor account. Most of the twenty clerical alumni maintain against all comers their posts as curates in various city parishes. If they are not elevated to higher offices, the failure is hardly to be imputed to their own unwillingness. Meantime, Fathers Francis Butler and Joseph Tracy, pioneers at Washington, are proving abundantly that the University does not unfit men for the task of administering parishes. And in the important field of University teaching, the Boston alumni are well represented at Washington by the Rev. Dr. Charles F. Aiken. The latter may feel assured that his confederates at home are proud of his success as a professor, and delighted with the articles and reviews that appear from time to time bearing his signature.

These miscellaneous data from Baltimore, Syracuse, the Paulist Congregation and the New England dioceses, are but samples, I take it, of similar records being made in all parts of the country by the graduates of our Pontifical University. For a separate paragraph should be reserved the listing of a second set of facts of peculiar interest. That many University men should devote themselves to teaching, was to be expected from the special character of the training they had received. The University was designed in part to be the nursery of teachers, who would continue

her own salutary work both at Washington and in the seminaries and colleges of the country. The actual selection of so many of her graduates for teaching posts is a tribute from bishops and rectors to the excellence of her methods of instruction.

How many of the alumni are now engaged as professors, I am not prepared to state, but I know that the number is large. It was particularly pleasing to learn that three young graduates were appointed professors at the New York Seminary last fall, Fathers Albert, Mitty, and Scanlan. The new President of Dunwoodie, Dr. Chidwick, may also be claimed as an alumnus, since he studied at the University in 1898-99. When to these we add Father Francis Duffy of the middle 90's and Father John Brady of '99-'01, with perhaps others whom I do not at the moment recall, we realize that the University is well represented both in numbers and quality at the seminary of our greatest metropolis. At the Seminary of St. Paul, meantime, is continued the exceptionally scholarly work of the Rev. Dr. John A. Ryan, who received his supreme degree at the University in 1906. Though no other of our band were there, we should yet be well represented.

At our mother institution, the University itself, it is gratifying to note that alumni form a goodly fraction of the teaching staff. Besides the half dozen whose fame long service has made secure, the Rev. Drs. Kerby, Maguire, Aiken, Shields, Melody, and Healy, we can count now Dr. Fox and Judge De Lacy, and since last year Dr. Weber of the Marists, who a year ago received the most coveted of the University degrees after long years of faithful study. *Pro patribus tuis nati sunt tibi filii*. The sons have become fathers in their turn, and will beget and foster other spiritual children of the same noble race and quality.

To a third species of pursuit the alumni have devoted themselves in the past year more abundantly than ever before. A year ago your historian expressed the hope that the alumni would venture more frequently into the field of literary endeavor. It may be confessed that the historian's suggestion was partly prompted by an ulterior motive, inasmuch as he himself had in contemplation at the time the publication of a work of a more or less literary character; and, while this is not meant as an advertisement, he must now make the further confession that he has done the deed. The product is called *Astronomical Essays*.

From one point of view the historian wishes he had not ex-



horted quite so strongly. For, as is said in the *Bulletin* for June, "signs of literary activity among the Alumni are multiplying day by day," a gratifying fact no doubt, but ominous for the appointed chronicler of alumni doings. *The Divine Story*, by Father Holland of Providence, has already reached a fourth edition; Dr. Shields, in collaboration with Dr. Pace, has issued the second of his excellent series of books on *Religion*. About Christmas there appeared the collection of thoughtful essays by Father Joseph McSorley, the Paulist, entitled *The Sacrament of Duty*. Somewhat later came a brochure on *The Church and Interest Taking*, from the pen of Dr. Ryan of St. Paul. The younger alumni, too, threaten to rush into print. *The Courage of Christ*, by Father Henry Schuyler of Philadelphia, a graduate of five years ago, did not need apparently the nine years' storage process recommended by Horace. That the lay alumni meanwhile have not been idle is indicated by Mr. Dunlap's monograph on *The Chinese Question*.

Some of our publications, moreover, are finding their way into foreign tongues, as witness Dr. Ryan's *The Living Wage*, translated into French last October, and the *Question Box*, by Father Conway, C. S. P., translated into Spanish for use in Spanish-American countries. All these authors,—and there are probably some overlooked in this imperfect record,—deserve from their brother alumni encouragement proportionate to the honor they reflect on the entire graduate body.

This hurried report is unable to take due notice of the numerous articles and book reviews by alumni in the *Bulletins* of the past twelve months. Where without us, for example, would have been the May *Bulletin*, with its leading articles by Fathers Dowling and Hassett, Drs. Aiken and Shields? The Rector's November list of publications by University professors would have been reduced in length one-half if there were taken out the articles, addresses and reviews by our fellow-alumni, Drs. Aiken, Fox, Healy, Kerby, Maguire, Shields, and Judge de Lacy. So it appears that alumni both in and out of the University have been moiling and toiling to supply grist for the printing-presses of the country.

Last year we recorded the promotion of an alumnus to the episcopal rank. This year a similar happy event has occurred in the consecration of the Rt. Rev. Joseph F. Busch on May 19th as

Bishop of Lead, South Dakota. The class that entered the University at its inauguration in 1889 can now, therefore, boast of two bishops, Carroll, of Nueva Segovia in the Philippines, and Busch, the latest of our alumni prelates. It were enough to make other classes mildly jealous. But no, a much younger class had already had its turn when Father Rodriguez, a licentiate of 1902, was made Bishop of Pinar del Rio, Cuba, in June, 1907. We alumni are not, we trust, unduly aspiring. We have no wish to force ourselves into episcopal benefices. But greatness will out. The latest prelate chosen from the ranks of the alumni will not be the last.

Such, O University, is the report I bring you this year of the achievements of the sons you once harbored and then sent forth with your benediction to win their way in the world. And in response you greet your children, come home for a brief visit, and tell proudly of your triumphs and successes during the twelve-month just concluded. What a splendid year it has been here in our old cherished home! The family of sons, clerical and lay, larger than ever before, 250 students all told! The honors last June, the most numerous in your history, 66 degrees given as against 38 and 42 for the two years preceding! The transfer of your library to more commodious quarters and its enrichment, without assistance, be it noted, from the celebrated Pittsburg philanthropist! The branching out of your School of Sciences, the decision to construct a central power plant, and the well-founded hope of providing for Catholic laymen one of the best of technological schools! No wonder that your admirers who are blessed by God with wealth have been this year doubly generous. In the February *Bulletin* you were able to announce two donations of \$100,000 each, and, just before, you had received a similar sum from the American Catholic faithful.

But you were worthy of even these princely offerings. Your coadjutors, the professors, deserved this endorsement of their earnest labors and praiseworthy zeal. And, above all, your new helmsman, to whom was due the principal credit for this year's mighty efforts, your new rector, Monsignor Shahan, was worthy of this encouragement. To the minds of all the alumni it was a fitting reward for service perfectly accomplished when Dr. Shahan was made actual Rector of the University, May 27th, 1909, and invested as Domestic Prelate to His Holiness, December 16th.

We expected great things from Dr. Shahan's rule, and our expectations have been realized. Indeed they have been surpassed. For while we were prepared for scholastic evolutions along many lines, we had not anticipated those fortnightly "smokers" at Albert Hall, or the projection of a new gymnasium, or the creation in a single season under Manager Shahan of a baseball nine that would win nine successive victories and twice trail in the dust proud Georgetown's venerable colors.

Therefore, dear Right Reverend Rector, we congratulate you on the showing of the University during the past year. It has been a notable year in her history. Under God's Providence may the years to follow be fraught with equal success and happiness, and witness the accomplishment of the many schemes for good that your mind contemplates and your heart desires. Count always upon the eager interest and moral support of your former students. They are with the University heart and soul. They will try, out there in the field of life, to bring her fame and glory. They will spread the knowledge of her name and deeds. And the historians of the future will bring back each year to our Alma Mater fuller sheaves and richer harvests, the records of the good deeds and beneficent accomplishments of her devoted alumni.

---



## UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

---

**Commencement Exercises.** Cardinal Gibbons presided on Wednesday, June 8, at the twenty-first annual commencement of the Catholic University of America. The exercises were held in McMahon Hall, which was filled to capacity with a distinguished audience. Forty-six students received degrees.

The principal address was made by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D., rector of the University.

The Rev. Dr. Charles F. Aiken, dean of the school of theology, presented the following eighteen candidates for the degree of S. T. B.: The Rev. John Hilary Stromberg, La Crosse, Wis.; the Rev. Francis Michael O'Reilly, New York; the Rev. Thomas Ligouri McEntee, Steelton, Pa.; the Rev. Philo Laos Mills, Baltimore; the Rev. Robert Emmet B. Gardiner, Scranton, Pa.; the Rev. John Joseph Fleming, and the Rev. Edward John Deevy, both of New York; the Rev. Eugene Paul Burke, the Rev. John Connor McGinn, and the Rev. James Henry Gallagan, of the Congregation of the Holy Cross; the Rev. Julian Emile Bouvy, the Rev. Simeon Daniel, the Rev. Francis Anthony Halbwachs, the Rev. Joseph George Off, the Rev. Peter Francis Quinn, the Rev. Paul Rietsch, of the Marist Congregation; the Rev. Stephen Joseph Zmich, Congregation of Missionaries of Divine Love, and the Rev. John Carter Smyth, of the Paulists.

The S. T. L. degree was conferred on the Rev. Edward Herman Amsinger, of St. Louis, Mo.; the Rev. James Deenihan, of Los Angeles, Cal.; the Rev. John Capistran Gruden, of St. Paul, Minn.; the Rev. Walter Alexander O'Hara, of Pittsburg, Pa.; the Rev. John Conrad Melies, of St. Louis, Mo.; the Rev. John Connor McGinn, of Congregation of the Holy Cross and the Rev. Joseph Patrick Munday, of Alton, Ill.

Judge William C. Robinson, dean of the law school, presented James Herbert Farraher, of Yreka, Cal., for the degree



of LL. B. For the degree of LL. M. he presented Benjamin Franklin Cator, LL. B., of Baltimore; Oswald Martin Crotty, LL. B., Cleveland; Martin Francis Douglas, A. B., Greensboro, N. C., and Boutwell Dunlap, LL. B., San Francisco, Cal.

Otis Beall Kent, LL. M., Washington, D. C., and Margotaro Makino, of Tokyo, Japan, received the degree of J. D.

The Rev. Edward A. Pace, dean of the school of philosophy, presented for the degree of Ph. D. the Rev. Charles Leo O'Donnell, the Rev. Charles Louis Dorémus, and the Rev. Michael Aloysius Quinlan, all of the Congregation of the Holy Cross.

Dr. Pace also presented for the degree of Ph. M. the Rev. Joseph Patrick Green, of New York, and the Rev. Patrick Joseph Waters, of Boston.

The Rev. John D. McGuire, dean of the school of letters, presented for the degree of A. B. Raymond Nathaniel Caverly, of Minneapolis, Minn.; James Ivers, Jr., Salt Lake City, Utah; William Patrick Kilcoyne, Danbury Conn.; Walter Shanley McElroy, of Bridgeport, Conn., and Donald Joseph Gallagher, El Paso, Texas.

The Rev. John J. Griffin, dean of the school of science, presented for the degree of B. S. Karl Ernst Gury, Bernard Philip Hessler, and John Walker Kelly, of Washington, D. C., and the Rev. Roderick Kennedy McIntyre, Antigonish, Nova Scotia.

It was announced that Professor Gabert, of Newark, N. J., would become instructor of ecclesiastical music in October.

At the conclusion of the exercises Mgr. Shahan entertained at dinner, among his guests being Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Falconio.

**Alumni Meeting.** The Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Catholic University Alumni Association was held at Maison Rauscher, June 7, 1910. It was the best attended of any reunion thus far held, and the cheer and good fellowship were proportionately enhanced.

The report on the Bouquillon Library Fund was read by Dr. Kerby and accepted. In order to hasten the completion

of this fund, Dr. Kerby was instructed to assess every member ten dollars annually until the amount promised to the University be completed.

Father Leahy, the Historian of the Society, read an interesting paper which is published elsewhere in this number. The perennial question regarding the final form of a constitution again came up, and after some discussion an agreement was reached regarding the clause referring to the eligibility for membership.

It was also decided to raise the annual dues to two dollars. It was determined finally to hold the next meeting in Washington on the day preceding the commencement day at the University.

Rev. Fathers Dowling, Smith and Sullivan were constituted a committee to nominate the officers for the ensuing year. Upon their suggestion the following were reëlected for a second term:

<i>President,</i>	- - - - -	REV. WM. T. RUSSELL, D. D.
<i>First Vice-President,</i>	- -	REV. WM. J. KERBY, PH. D.
<i>Second Vice-President,</i>	-	REV. THOS. BURKE, C. S. P.
<i>Secretary and Treasurer,</i>	-	REV. JOHN W. MELODY, D. D.
<i>Executive Committee,</i>	- -	REV. THOS. MCGUIGAN.
		REV. CHAS. F. AIKEN, D. D.
		REV. THOS. E. SHIELDS, PH. D.
		REV. WM. FLETCHER, D. D.
		REV. MICHAEL CRANE.

The Rev. William Livingstone of New York was unanimously elected an honorary member of the Association. After adjournment of the meeting came the banquet and right heartily was it enjoyed.

A feature introduced upon the occasion was the singing of various songs, the words of which were expressly composed for the event. During the dinner the Right Reverend Rector spoke of the past achievements and future prospects of the University. His discourse was received with enthusiastic applause.

---